

1 Aurora Bautista Quicho
2 207 Albatross Lane
3 Fountain Valley, California

4 [NGLL: phone numbers are optional not mandatory;]

5 [Julz: on line 7, i would add the below, and put the name of the public court of record in
6 speech marks, though please take notice NGLL would not do that]

7 the Julian Court of Record at the

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

9 [NGLL: at line 8 you put the name of the court centered as above;]¹

10 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

11
12 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF) CASE NO. BC324176
13 CALIFORNIA,)
14 Plaintiff) COUNTERCLAIM
15) FOR TRESPASS, AND
16 v.) TRESPASS ON THE CASE
17)
18 Aurora Bautista Quicho,) VERIFIED
19 Defendant.)

20 _____)
21)
22 Aurora Bautista Quicho,)
23 Counterclaimant,)
24)
25 v.)
26)

27 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF)
28 CALIFORNIA, Federal Credit Union,)
29 Land Rover South Bay,)
30 Mercedes Benz South Bay,)
31 Quaker City Bank, Mark S. Arnold,)
32 Amy-Hannah Broersma,)
33 Eileen C. Butko, Complainer Doe,)
34 FCU Doe, Land Doe, Mercedes Doe,)
35 Quaker Doe, Laura C. Ellison,)
36 Gregg Hayata, Omar Hazel,)
37 David Hizami, Lisa V. Houle,)
38 1168 Johnson, Jodi Michelle Link,)
39 Grady Miles, Paulette Paccione,)
40 C. Rose, Sanjay Sahgal,)
41 John Torrelli, Thomas R. Sokolov,)
42 John Shepard Wiley Jr. and)
43 Cynthia Zuzga,)
44)
45 Counterdefendants.)

46 -----)
47 [NGLL: this is the case caption, when we went up to the window to file this, the first time we went to
48 the criminal court, and we had the criminal case number on there, they said: "Oh no we don't handle
49 civil, you got to go over there" well it's all one court and they should have taken it, but they didn't,
50 well who am i to argue...!? i don't argue with these people, you know there's an unlimited number of
51 opportunities to do battle here and these people are awash in ignorance and as [Johann Wolfgang von]
52 Goethe, the German Philosopher, said: "There is nothing more frightful than ignorance in action." so
53 you know you have all this ignorance and it does make it harder, but as it turns out you can roll with it
54 to some degree, and so when the Clerk said "We can't accept that because this is civil." we said ok
55 we're civil and let ourselves be pointed down the hall and to another building, so went over there
56 presented it for filing, of course now we don't know what case number we're gonna get because it's
57 not the same case and so the Clerk looks at it and said: "Well we don't accept counterclaims." boy he

¹ The people own the government; the government owns the citizens. If you're one of the people, then the state court is your court. You can create your own branch court with the same name as the gov't court. You own both courts.

58 really didn't know what it was, that's what it boiled down to, all he knew, you know they got routine,
59 the Los Angeles court system is the largest court system in the world, i mean it isn't just bigger than
60 any court in the United States, it's bigger than any court in the world, and they got it so divided, i
61 mean there's a specialist in everything, there's a specialist who takes filings, there's a specialist who
62 takes motions, (lol) you name it they got a specialist to deal with it, so i realized i was dealing with a
63 specialist who never heard of a counterclaim probably, so he said: "*I couldn't take that.*", i said: "*Ok*
64 *what else...!?*" he looked at it and said: "*The caption's wrong we can't have up here 'The People of*
65 *the State of California vs. Aurora Quicho'* so you need to take this back and change these headings.",
66 the rest of the sentence that he did not say is that you need to change these things to meet my
67 understanding, so here we have all these counterclaimants and counterdefendants, so after he told me
68 all that was wrong with it that he didn't like, i then took the paper back, and he was expecting me to
69 go back fix it and come back, but what i did instead, was with my hand and a pen i scratched out
70 counterclaim and wrote complaint instead, then over on the left side i put a big x through plaintiff and
71 defendant, that top left part of the caption, so that all got scratched out and then lower down we
72 changed *Counterclaimant* to *Plaintiff* and we changed *Counterdefendants* to *Defendants* and i handed
73 it back to him, i said: "*How's that...!?*" and he said: "*Fine.*", now why was it that i was able to do it
74 by hand...!? well the reason is if you look in the procedures, the California Rules of Court that all the
75 papers must be type written, and if you then read further you find out that type written means; put
76 onto paper in reproducible ink that is clear and easy to read, so in other words hand writing is type
77 writing, so that's why the Clerk was able to accept it, and having been a drafts man in the past i do
78 print very clearly so it met his requirements and he filed it, now later on, one of the attorneys in his
79 demurrer, he pointed out that in the caption they were labeled as *Plaintiff* and *Defendant*, but in the
80 body we were using *Counterclaimant* and *Counterdefendant* and he was confused, (lol) he didn't
81 know who was who, what was what and so forth, so in our answer to his demurrer we pointed out and
82 you should remember this rule, and that is that – headings do not control, what controls is the body,
83 that's why i was so willing to go ok i'll scratch out all these headings, all these titles, whatever, none
84 of those control the actual suit, all this caption does is it enables the Clerk to file the papers, so the
85 body is what controls, and it's what you say there that counts, now you will notice it says further
86 down "FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION – TRESPASS" and the "PARTIES" all that is is headings, those
87 do not control, the purpose of headings is to kind of help you get a picture of what's going on, but if
88 there's a conflict between what the heading says and what's in the body, the body of the writing takes
89 precedence;

90 if you really get technical, if you really do it right, you put the original case, like the criminal case; the
91 people v. Aurora and then you draw a horizontal line and you put down Aurora v. the people as
92 counterdefendants, you are the counter plaintiff and they are the counterdefendants, whereas in the
93 original case they were the plaintiff and she was the defendant, so counter means to go the opposite
94 direction, and whilst she was at it, not only did she sue the people of the state of California, she also
95 sued a few extra defendants, and so we have all the judges that were involved named, i want you to
96 know something; there are no John Does per se, i mean we have Land Doe over here, we've got
97 Mercedes Doe, Quaker Doe, and so forth, FCU Doe, Complainer Doe, the reason... you should
98 understand it's worthless to put Does one to fifty, or something like that, the reason it's worthless is
99 because you're just putting in a fictitious name, but that's not any good, what you do is you have to
100 say what this person did, the whole idea of having a John)Doe, or a Mary Roe, is to be able to give a
101 name to a person who's name you don't know, but you know what they did to you, so in your lawsuit
102 you have to specify that John Doe, this, this, this, whatever, you say what injuries he caused, and you
103 give him a name because you don't know his name, that's the only purpose of a Doe; you have to
104 make your claim timely if you're in the statutory system 'cuz there are statutes that limit the amount
105 of time you have to make your claim and that way you don't have to know the name of the person,
106 you can make your claim, in the case of common law there are no statutes of limitations for one
107 simple reason: there's no statutes, statutes don't exist in the common law, the only way a statute can
108 have any standing, or validity is for the sovereign to decree it, now if you decree it, then the statute
109 exists not by legislative authority but by the authority of the sovereign; ok so anyway we named a
110 whole bunch of people, that's how the Does fit in here, and you'll notice that i did not put things like

111 the honourable so and so... hey these guys never had an office, because they never established
112 jurisdiction, that's whole position, and we don't recognize titles of nobility, so they're just human
113 beings if you will; then on the right side we say it's verified, verified means that you declare under
114 penalty and perjury that the foregoing is true and correct, or you can affirm it, if you don't declare it
115 you can affirm it, but the whole idea is that you're testifying that this is truth, and you're willing to get
116 beat up and thrown in jail if you're caught lying, that's really what it's all about, now you have to
117 understand this: i know as Ron had pointed out, that this has its roots in religion but, the approach that
118 we take here it's as if religion didn't exist, we're very secular, down to earth, we point to specific
119 earthly things for whatever our reasoning process is, so if you must have a religious basis, or some
120 sort of, i guess biblical attribute, or whatever, i guess what we could say is that... how can i say this,
121 well basically we don't recognize, you see the bible says something to the effect that Satan owns this
122 world, so the way i divide it up is that there's god's world, and there's Satan's world, if it's Satan's
123 world we call it secular, that's what it means to me, and i proceed on that basis, and remember the
124 rule, and i lean on this rule heavily: if the person fails to object it means he agrees, so if i make
125 whatever claim i do, well then that's what is if they fail to object, and by the way they always fail to
126 object as you will see; alright so verified means that this really is the truth that we put in here, now the
127 truth means as far as facts, you don't have to verify law, you only verify facts, so now we go down to
128 the actual body of this thing;]

129 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION – TRESPASS**

130 **PARTIES**

131 [NGLL: we have a cause of action trespass, now this lawsuit, pretty much i think you'll probably have
132 to agree looks like an attorney might have written it, but there is one key set of words that makes it
133 different, and that's right here, right in the beginning, right from the get go:]

134 1. **Aurora Bautista Quicho, (hereinafter "Aurora") is one of the**
135 **people of California, and in this court of record complains of**
136 **each of the following:** [Julz: i would say: "at this public venue/open court,
137 through the *Julian Court of Record* (hereinafter "**JCoR**") herein convened, i, [a] man (one
138 of the people under god, [my own] master [among mankind], by the proper and non-
139 negotiable given-name of Julian [Cf. Julian Jeremiah]), herein the *Aggrieved-*
140 *Party/Claimant*, claim against the following: Diane McCorry, Steven McCrory, Karen
141 Thomas, and Darren Thomas, (each hereinafter "*Trespasser*", or "*Wrongdoer*", and all
142 collectively "*Trespassers*", or "*Wrongdoers*"); who are each summoned to answer to this
143 claim for trespass and trespass on the case, to wit:" though please take notice, once again,
144 that is not how NGLL would put it and for very good reasons also: for starters the above is ten
145 times more likely to raise alarm bells, and potentially cause the proverbial *They* to take a more
146 back-footed stance towards what *They* believe you're doing, or are gonna do which might upset
147 the status quo;] [NGLL: now that simple first little sentence, i guess those of you who have seen
148 the previous seminars know about this, but that simple little sentence is really disarming,
149 disarms the opposition, because typical attorney is gonna read this and say "one of the people of
150 California" what does that mean...!? you know... ok so she's a people, well what it means is
151 you're a sovereign, by saying you're one of the people of California absolutely establishes your
152 sovereignty, and the burden is on them to prove that you're not sovereign, now the second this is
153 that "in this court of record complains of each of the following" so she's established this is a
154 court of record, you see when you're suing you can pick your form, you can go into admiralty,
155 equity, whatever, she chose court of record, and what is a court of record...!? it's a court that
156 must meet these five requirements: "**1. keeps a record of the proceedings**, 2. the tribunal is
157 independent of the magistrate (judge), 3. proceeding according to the common law, **4. power to**
158 **fine and imprison for contempt**, 5. generally has a seal," an attorney reading these papers, he
159 probably has the latest and best dictionaries and the latest and best dictionaries leave out items
160 number 2, 3 and 5 so he looks it up and sees it keeps a record of the proceedings, oh ok that
161 makes sense to him, has the power to fine and imprison for contempt, sure they taught that in
162 law school, ok...!? that's all they have in their dictionaries, so he probably doesn't know, but

163 you got to understand something: i got no sympathy for these guys, because these guys, if you
164 get one of their business cards they say they're an attorney at law, at law means common law,
165 but what they all are is attorneys in equity, statutes are equity, so they're all practicing by
166 statutes not one of them ever practice real law, they're not in common law, but they all say
167 they're attorneys at law, well i what, i'm sure are aware of this idea that if you have a social
168 security number somehow it puts you in jurisdiction as a citizen of the United States and this
169 type of thing, that they do that to you, in other words the constitution defines the citizens of the
170 United States as somebody who's either born or naturalized in the country **and is subject to the**
171 **jurisdiction**, ok now **if you're one of the people you're born and naturalized but you're not**
172 **subject**, so they don't teach that half of it, they just teach you the requirements of citizenship,
173 then later on if an issue comes up, they'll ask you: "*Are you a citizen of the United States?*" if
174 you say yes, you just told them that you are subject to their jurisdiction, so that's how they do it,
175 well **you take the title – you get the qualifications**, well this is exactly how i deal with
176 attorneys: they take the title attorney at law – i'm gonna assume they have the knowledge, they
177 were the ones who bragged about it, so i just hold them to their word, actually i don't have to
178 hold them to their word because they're not trying to get out of it... (lol) they go in head first, so
179 if they're an attorney at law – that means they know law, and they know common law because
180 that's what "*at law*" means – common law, and we're gonna run that court according to
181 common law, it's not my problem if they don't know what they're doing, if they made false
182 claims, if you're gonna make a false claim – you deserve what you get right...!? so "*in this*
183 *court of record complains of the following:*" and this is the only special deal in the entire
184 system, no-no there's one other thing, it's where you decree the law, but as you work through
185 this you can see, there's the defendants and so on...] **State of California, Federal**
186 **Credit Union, Land Rover South Bay, Mercedes Benz South Bay,**
187 **Quaker City Bank, Mark S. Arnold, Amy-Hannah Broersma, Eileen C.**
188 **Butko, Complainer Doe, FCU Doe, Land Doe, Mercedes Doe, Quaker**
189 **Doe, Laura C. Ellison, Gregg Hayata, Omar Hazel, David Hizami,**
190 **Lisa V. Houle, 1168 Johnson, Jodi Michelle Link, Grady Miles,**
191 **Paulette Paccione, C. Rose, Sanjay Sahgal, John Torrelli, Thomas**
192 **R. Sokolov, John Shepard Wiley Jr., and Cynthia Zuzga (each**
193 **hereinafter "Kidnapper", and all collectively "Kidnappers"); who**
194 **are each summoned to answer the said counterclaimant in a plea**
195 **of trespass and trespass on the case, to wit: [NGLL: so we named all**
196 **these people as Counterdefendants and now remember this, you know it becomes cumbersome**
197 **when you wanna talk about somebody, a party or whatever, it becomes cumbersome to name all**
198 **28 defendants over and over again, so to make a short cut you can always give them a nickname,**
199 **just like we said right in the beginning that "(hereinafter "Aurora")", that makes it easier**
200 **reading, remember the other person who's reading the papers is a human being and so for that**
201 **person you wanna make it easy to read and understand it, so it's good to pick something that is**
202 **easy to understand so we called her "Aurora" and then the rest of the paper refers to her either as**
203 **"Aurora Bautista Quicho", or as simply "Aurora", either way it means the same thing because**
204 **what have we done...!? we set up our own dictionary, the definition of "Aurora" is "Aurora**
205 **Bautista Quicho", of course we also set up a definition for the others, and you have 28**
206 **defendants, so rather than to refer to all 28 names at the same time, we refer to them just by one**
207 **name, and it was "(each hereinafter "Kidnapper", and all collectively "Kidnappers")" and that's**
208 **legit, you see it is wrong to call them kidnappers if you're making a judgment, because the**
209 **purpose of a complaint is to present to the court your information, so you cannot call them**
210 **kidnappers, but if you define the word kidnapper as a substitute for all these names, now it's**
211 **legit to use the word, so throughout this document we refer to them as kidnappers, so this is a**
212 **writing technique that could be very effectively used because what are you doing...!? remember**
213 **that in the art of communication a lot of times the image that you paint is very important and if**
214 **you can paint an image without painting an image that's the ultimate in expressing yourself and**
215 **that's what we did, we didn't say they were kidnappers, we just said that's their name;**

216 you know you can have a lot of fun in writing papers sometimes if you use a little creativity, i
217 remember one time, just as a side note, we had an attorney (01:08:15) that was really a jerk, i
218 mean you couldn't communicate anything with her, and this guy was trying to communicate you

219 know because after all the rules of court say that whenever you have a motion or something
220 going on, that before you have an actual hearing the parties should attempt to get together and
221 talk, it's called "a meeting confer requirement" so somewhere there's a rule i don't know why
222 the number 202 sticks in my mind i could be totally wrong, but anyway there is a meet and
223 confer rule, and what you do is you're supposed to contact the other party or the other attorney
224 if he has an attorney and you meet and you confer about it to see what you can accomplish, now
225 if you can't accomplish anything you give a report to the court saying that you tired to meet and
226 confer but you could not agree because of such and such and both sides can put in their little
227 report to the court, the whole idea is to try and get this procedure running as smoothly as
228 possible and really the last thing the judges wanna do is sit in judgment, they would much rather
229 the parties settle it earlier if possible, well this person called up the attorney and he said
230 something whatever it was, and the attorney, a female attorney, she said "*Horse shit.*" and so
231 then he said something else to her, and she said "*Horse shit*" and so then he said something else
232 to her and she said "*That's a bunch of horse shit.*" so it's obvious they weren't communicating
233 right...!? so in the report to the court we used that term, we quoted her, after all she's a
234 professional and you know she's probably using professional language, and so we wrote this, we
235 organized it, you know you're format is important too, you want it to be easy for a person to
236 read, so we structured it so that the story began at the top of the page and ended at the bottom of
237 the page and the very last sentence, now this was a factual report, that means we're testifying,
238 now what is testimony...!? or what are facts...!? facts are anything that affects the five senses,
239 so you have **seeing, hearing, smelling, feeling and tasting, so you testify to one or more of**
240 **those**, for example you know most of the testimony is what did you see..!? but that's only one of
241 the senses, we as human beings have the ability to discern voices, if you heard your mother or
242 father speak would you recognize the voice even though you didn't see the person...!? very
243 likely you would, and so it's very valid to say "*i heard my mother saying something*" even
244 though you didn't see her, she might have been in the next room but you heard it, and if you
245 identify it, you can testify to that, **also there's a sixth item you can testify to, and that is to**
246 **your own personal state of mind**, you can testify that you were scared, happy, worried,
247 whatever, so back to this attorney who used professional language, or some technical language
248 we didn't understand, what we said in our very last sentence was "it is the opinion of the writer
249 of this paper..." ok he's testifying as to his own state of mind "*it is the opinion of the writer of*
250 *this paper that the attorney was suffering from a severe case of vowel motion*" LOL you know
251 you have consonants and vowel in the English language right... i'm sure the judge must have
252 enjoyed reading that one... but you know i don't hold any punches on these papers if somebody
253 wants to use filthy language i put it right in the court paper hey it wasn't me that said it, it was
254 him that said it, let them destroy their own reputation as a their own whatever, if they're
255 graceless let it show in the paper work, basically what i say is this, "*it's ok to tell the truth*" and
256 if that person is being obnoxious, just "*tell it like it is*", they can't use descent language, tell it
257 like it is, this is what they said, i'm sure that they'll hear about that at some point in time, so
258 anyway we collectively referred to them as "Kidnappers" so we can use the language;]

259

INTRODUCTION

260 1. **Each Kidnapper exceeded his jurisdiction by either directly,**
261 **through an agent, or in concert with another did cause**
262 **counterclaimant Aurora to be unlawfully and forcibly carried**
263 **away and imprisoned**¹ [NGLL: notice this we didn't say arrested you got to be careful
264 how you use words, because if you say she was arrested, well that's an official function, you're
265 acknowledging the official function, we never acknowledge the official function, we never
266 acknowledge the jurisdiction, we said she was "*forcibly carried away and imprisoned*", those
267 are neutral words, not arrested, there's a little side note, words are important, if you ever get
268 involved in a case where a gun is involved, understand never use the word weapon, a weapon is
269 an offensive item, a weapon is used for attacking, an arm is used for defending, **we have a right**
270 **to bear arms, not a right to bear weapons**, don't ever let them use the word weapon in a case

271 against you if ever comes to that, you say “*no it wasn’t a weapon, i never had a weapon, never*
272 *saw a weapon, i had an arm...*”, purely defensive, so there’s one little technical meaning they
273 don’t like us to know, but that’s how they do it; (01:15:23) let’s take the word client for
274 instance... let’s put it this way, a lot of you have businesses, do you call your customers
275 patients...!? you don’t have patients, doctors own the word patient, so you never call any of
276 your customers patients, even if you’re in alternative health you don’t call them patients, they
277 are called customers, why because the doctors own the word patient, that is their word, for
278 whatever reason, but they’ve taken command of that word, the word client means that’s a
279 customer of an attorney, the attorneys own the word client just the way doctors own the word
280 patient, so you do not have clients in your business, when you say that somebody is your client,
281 you are admitting that you are their agent, that you make decisions for them, that’s a whole lot
282 different than having a customer, a customer is somebody to whom you deliver information,
283 product, or something, but they retain full responsibility for the decision to buy it, accept it, and
284 use it, you’re not influencing them in the same sense that you would if you were their agent, so
285 don’t ever use the word client because that makes you their agent, that makes you their attorney,
286 so anyhow here we say “each Kidnapper exceeded his jurisdiction” and so forth and then we get
287 to define imprisoned out of the dictionary [see below footnote]; what does the court do...!?
288 when they let you out on your own recognizance, or they let you out on bail...!? don’t they have
289 a display of force...!? don’t they verbally let you know, you better do this or else... you got to
290 meet our terms, or else... the reason we put that footnote in there was because aurora had made
291 bail and she had been released for a while and then she was back in i guess and then she was
292 released, but the idea is that she was constantly imprisoned, even when she was out on bail she
293 was imprisoned, that was the point we were trying to make, coz she’s claiming in this lawsuit
294 \$50,000.00 for each day that she’s imprisoned; [continuation from before explanatory
295 interruption follows:] so she’s imprisoned–] **against her will, without**
296 **jurisdiction or good cause.** [NGLL: the phrase “*good cause*” is a technical
297 meaning, good cause means a legal reason, good cause does not mean *well we have a moral*
298 *justification*, not that at all, whenever you see “good cause” anywhere in the legal world, that
299 specifically means a *legal reason*;) **At the onset of the unlawful**
300 **imprisonment counterclaimant Aurora was duly² engaged in good**
301 **faith in a negotiation and purchase of a chose, and exercising**
302 **her substantive right to contract with another at arm’s length.**
303 [NGLL: now that sentence is loaded with legalities, we identified that it was from the beginning,
304 from the onset of the unlawful imprisonment counterclaimant was duly engaged, the word duly
305 means that it meets the requirements of both the common law and the statutory law, so she was
306 doing what was right, negotiating, you know you have an unlimited power to contract, so she
307 was negotiating, and if we look at footnote number two “²*Duly: ...according to law in both form*
308 *and substance*” equity deals with form, common law deals with substance and we said it was in
309 *good faith*, that’s important, had no hidden agenda, being upfront with the other person, and
310 trusting the other person to be upfront with her, and she was purchasing a chose, a chose is a
311 thing, in this case it was an automobile, and chose btw is a word that is used in common law,
312 that’s why we used it, “*and exercising her substantive right*” *a substantive right is a common*
313 *law right*, everybody heard of the Miranda decision, the read your rights decision, that decision
314 says specifically that where substantive rights are concerned, there shall be no rule making that
315 will abrogate them, i think that’s the actual wording, *in other words substantive rights are*
316 *common law rights, now you’ll notice i avoided saying common law, because i know that all*
317 *these attorneys, all these judges are all trained to go against the grain, against the common*
318 *law, it’s a policy,*

¹ Imprison: To confine a person or restrain his liberty in any way. Black’s Law Dictionary, 5th Edition Imprisonment: ...it may be in a locality used only for the specific occasion; or it may take place without the actual application of any

physical agencies of restraint (such as locks or bars), as by verbal compulsion and the display of available force. Black's Law Dictionary, 5th Edition

² Duly: ...according to law in both form and substance. Black's Law Dictionary, 5th Edition

319 **they don't want anything to do with the common law because frankly the common law is the**
320 **law of the people where as the statutory law is the law of their special interests,** so you
321 remember the purpose of a court, the number one purpose of a court above everything is that it's
322 a stage upon which you put on a good show to convince the rest of the world that you're right,
323 let's go back here in our fundamentals and let's look at court, and here it is:
324 <https://1215.org/lawnotes/lawnotes/court.htm> "A court is a stage upon which the sovereign
325 conducts his show so as to satisfy the rest of the world that his decision is a good one." so, keep
326 that in mind, this is very important, you're trying to impress, you see you depend on these
327 people, as much as we find ourselves in contention with them sometimes, the fact is we're
328 depending on them, and there are honest people in there, i really believe that, sometimes they're
329 hard to find, but they're in there, so if you give them good paper work, then you give them the
330 tools with which they can argue your case behind the scenes, so this particular web page goes
331 into the details as to why a court is a stage, and it is important for you to understand it is a stage,
332 you want people to have a clear picture as to why you're right and they're wrong, why do you
333 outrank the judge, whatever we put in any orders we always put in a complete explanation, i
334 mean we put in a half a dozen orders at least in this case and in every single one we explained it
335 as if we have never explained it before as to why it is that we're right, no one can ever pick up a
336 paper out of this case and say that we are presumptive or assumptive, when they pick up the
337 paper they get the whole explanation with it which makes it a little tough for them to argue with
338 **then:] Said Kidnappers, without good cause, interrupted the**
339 **negotiations, then imprisoned counterclaimant Aurora. During**
340 **imprisonment the Kidnappers took further casual ill-considered**
341 **actions to further imprison counterclaimant Aurora for up to**
342 **three years without trial or due process. [NGLL: now the reason we're**
343 **saying this is because what they did they shoved her over into patent for mental evaluation and**
344 **the court order actually said that she could be detained there for up to three years, how's that for**
345 **imprisonment without trial...!?** [Julz: "i, [a] man, require [the] point of law that authorizes
346 **You to communicate a threat in order to: —(a) extort funds for Your private-for-profit-**
347 **court (without having established jurisdiction), —(b) deny, or —(c) delay the course of**
348 **justice; absent point of law required equals attempt to: —(a) pervert the course of justice,**
349 **—(b) defraud i, [a] man, of property/substantive rights, in contempt of [the] law and the**
350 **Julian Court of Record, for what is expressed by a deliberate avoidance of such necessary**
351 **and proper response renders silent that which is implied, assumed, or presumed (Maxim**
352 **of Law) [Cf. "Expressum facit cessare tacitum. That which is expressed makes that which is**
353 **implied to cease. ... Where a law sets down plainly its whole meaning the court is prevented**
354 **from making it mean what the court pleases." Munro v. City of Albuquerque, 48 N.M. 306, 150**
355 **P.2d 733-4 [Emphasis added];"] [Audience Member: "home land security"] right well that was**
356 **before homeland security, that's an SOP for California, and by the way just as a little side note,**
357 **if you look up these codes that authorize such imprisonment for evaluative purposes, it's**
358 **interesting to notice that there is one group of persons in California that is 100% exempt, in fact**
359 **not only are they exempt, but there's an actual prohibition on doing any mental evaluations on**
360 **them, and that group is the Judges, they know the power of this to destroy, and they're not about**
361 **to subject themselves to it, [Audience Member: "is that legislature"] i believe it is, yeah it's the**
362 **legislation for, there's the Council and Judicial Performance which can order a review of the**
363 **record of the Judge and they can order a specific medical evaluation, they cannot go on fishing**
364 **trips, if there's some specific issue they can order that the doctor go to a professional and have**
365 **just that one thing evaluated, but in any case they are absolutely prohibited from ordering a**
366 **Judge to get a psychological evaluation, so it's ok if he's crazy [Audience Member says**
367 **something inaudible] absolutely in fact i think you have a very strong argument relating to titles**
368 **of nobility [Audience Member: "that's discriminatory"] of course it's discriminatory, that's**
369 **exactly what a title of nobility is, it's discrimination, so here the Judges have a title of nobility**

370 where they are exempt from whatever is applied to everyone else, so anyhow, i planned it at
371 some point to use that in the papers, we're saving that one;]

372 2. From the moment she was taken away till the present, Aurora,
373 under color of law, [NGLL: colour of law is a technical term, there is law and then
374 there's colour of law, law is the real thing, colour of law is a pretence; it's just like i remember
375 one time this is before i really got involved in this stuff, but one time a cop stopped me,
376 (01:29:29) and i did not have adequate registration on the car, so he gave me a ticket, and then
377 he noticed that at about 100 yards down the street there was a construction going on, and
378 because there was construction going on, according to the code he was also authorized to
379 remove the car that might be blocking the construction, well of course it's 100 yards away,
380 that's the length of a football field, and so what's he doing...!? he's using colour of law, the
381 pretence of law, because he's taken some vindictive action, so he took the car and left me
382 walking, this is what's called colour of law and it is unlawful under federal law for anyone
383 under colour of law to deprive another person of any right, privilege, or benefit even, so if i
384 would have known that at the time i would have probably made a good issue of that, and btw
385 there's no statute of limitation, i probably still could, but somehow i made it so i could keep
386 busy with other issues;] was kept in actual or constructive imprisonment.
387 [NGLL: the word *constructive means that you're able to construct your conclusion out of the*
388 *fact at hand*, so we construct from all the order that were issued, from things that were said, that
389 she was actually imprisoned constructively, you have similar things like for example let's say
390 you're living in an apartment and the landlord does not fix the roof and so the place is really not
391 habitable, coz water's leaking in, or whatever else, you have been constructively evicted from
392 the premises, so constructive is a powerful word coz you can say "well no, he didn't say i was
393 evicted, but you can tell from the facts and the landlords actions or inactions i was evicted
394 constructively, as there was no place for me to live, i was in a place not actually suitable for
395 human habitability" so constructive is a powerful word, *constructive notice as distinguished*
396 *from actual notice from the fact that you should have had notice on something*, whatever it
397 is;] Although she objected to the assumed jurisdiction, those who
398 kept her imprisoned under color of law did not respond to any of
399 her demands and requests for proof of jurisdiction or for
400 reinstatement of her liberty. [NGLL: now that's a *factual statement, she*
401 *objected and they did not respond*, now *later on they demurred, which means they agree* this is
402 all true, you see the power of that...!? so we're setting them up basically;] They continued
403 to assume the jurisdiction without proof of jurisdiction [NGLL:
404 now when we say they assumed jurisdiction without proof of jurisdiction those are all
405 *statements of conclusion*, so *they don't' really count as facts*, but what does count as a fact is
406 that they made no attempt at proof, there was no action on their part; (01:34:22)] or any
407 attempt at proof of jurisdiction. She was denied counsel of her
408 choice. She was forced to accept counsel not of her choice
409 against her wishes. Counterclaimant Aurora continues to be
410 subject, under color of law, to the assumed jurisdiction, will
411 and control of the Kidnappers.

412 3. Under color of law Aurora was twice subjected to pseudo-
413 psychological evaluation. [NGLL: the word *pseudo means false*, not the real thing;]
414 The first pseudo-psychological evaluation failed to satisfy her
415 Kidnappers. The second pseudo-psychological-evaluation resulted
416 in a star-chamber court-ordered incarceration of up to three
417 years...without any trial, with the concurrence of the uninvited
418 court-imposed counsel, and without opportunity for
419 counterclaimant to object.

420 [NGLL: they shut her down, they told her directly that she could not speak, she had counsel
421 now, ok so that is the overview of this whole lawsuit, and that's good, remember there's a
422 conversational technique:

423 **1) you tell people what you're going to tell them, then**

424 **2) you tell them, and then**

425 **3) you tell them what you told them,**

426 as they say, so the telling them what you're going to tell them, and the telling them of what you
427 told them, those are basically summaries, but then you have in the middle the detail, so we just
428 went through the summary, and in fact we labeled it with the heading "INTRODUCTION", and
429 then we get into the specifics; (01:36:15)]

430

SPECIFICS

431 **4. Each counterdefendant acted in such a way, or failed to act in**
432 **such a way,** [NGLL: now you understand that if you look at title 42 section 1983, isn't that
433 the one that basically says that you have an obligation to act to prevent harm, so this is where
434 we're heading with this, because it's entirely possible this case is going to end up in federal
435 court, because once we exhaust the state procedures, and we show that there's absolutely no
436 protective process at that level, then we go to the federal courts; [Audience Member: "*At what*
437 *point do you determine that you've exhausted state remedy...!?*"] well you can go through the
438 state remedies, you know the procedures, when you run out of procedures and the supreme court
439 says "*No*" you've run out; they're the highest procedural authority in the state, so there is no
440 more opportunity to argue within the state after that, but you don't necessarily have to wait till
441 then, sometimes it just seems to become blatant that these people don't let you speak when you
442 want to speak, right here we run out... well actually we still have the appellate procedure and
443 that sort of thing, which we're not using because we claim we're right all along, so we're
444 kicking it upstairs but on a different foundation, instead of appealing it what we're doing is
445 we're saying we need the power of the court, decision's already made [Audience Member:
446 "*when you take it to the federal court do you take it as a habeas corpus or would you take some*
447 *other action...!?*"] that's a strategy decision, you know you kind of have to size up the enemy
448 and figure out which is more on your side, in this case i would tend to wanna do a lawsuit,
449 because i basically want to get a piece of their hide, see ***in a habeas corpus there's nothing***
450 ***punitive, or compensatory, really all habeas corpus is, is a determination of status, and then***
451 ***whatever orders issue, those orders are based on that status,*** but in a lawsuit, coz ***a habeas***
452 ***corpus is not actually a lawsuit,*** in a real lawsuit you have a Plaintiff, and you have a
453 Defendant, and you have injuries, and you wanna get paid for those injuries, compensated for
454 your losses [Audience Member: "*Can you file both?*"] sure, they're independent of each other,
455 yeah you can do either one, and ***habeas corpus is unique in that you can file it any time before,***
456 ***during, or after judgment, so it's never too soon*** [Audience Member says something inaudible]
457 well that's ok, there was one point in here where they said that her habeas corpus when she did
458 put one in, they said it was premature except they didn't know how to spell it so they said
459 premature... (lol) but in any case they said it was premature but ***it's never premature for habeas***
460 ***corpus*** the whole question is jurisdiction, if they have no jurisdiction then you shouldn't be
461 subject to it;] **that counterclaimant Aurora is deprived of her liberty.**
462 **Each counterdefendant acted to deprive counterclaimant Aurora of**
463 **her liberty; or each counterdefendant failed to act to prevent**
464 **the loss by counterclaimant Aurora of her liberty. Further, each**
465 **counterdefendant is a willing participant in concert with each**
466 **of the remaining counterdefendants.** [NGLL: so this is a set up for conspiracy,
467 you don't have to use the word conspiracy for it to be conspiracy we just said willing participant
468 in collaboration with the others and that is a fact, and they never denied it, in their demurer they
469 admitted, (01:40:59) i think this will look good if we get into the federal courts, what does the
470 IRS do? IRS sends out a notice, "*You failed to respond*" right... and they send out other notices,

471 or whatever, but you don't use the right technique, because you did not properly object, it means
472 you agree, by the time you end up in court, all they do is they say "Well look you did this, this,
473 this, you never really objected, so... the court has no choice but to convict" well we're doing the
474 same thing to them, we're just saying here's the things that happened, if they don't object it
475 must be true and we're gonna hold them to it too;]

476 **5. At all times mentioned in this action each counterdefendant is**
477 **the agent of the other, and in doing the acts alleged in this**
478 **action, each is acting within the course and scope of said**
479 **agency. The following paragraphs describe what the Kidnappers,**
480 **under color of law, either acted or failed to act as obligated.**

481 **6. Each counterdefendant exceeded his jurisdiction under color of**
482 **law. Each counterdefendant acted in concert with the remaining**
483 **counterdefendants to effect the unlawful loss of liberty of**
484 **counterclaimant Aurora. [NGLL: notice we never use the word arrest, in my opinion**
485 **there's no such thing as a false arrest, an arrest is an arrest that's an official function, it might be**
486 **wrong, but it's definitely a real arrest, so that's why i avoid using the word arrest;]**

487 **7. On or about June 29, 2004, Land Doe (an agent of Land Rover**
488 **South Bay) [NGLL: i wanna tell you something, we had no knowledge of how this arrest**
489 **came about, we were largely guessing, so you have to understand that in this case we didn't**
490 **really know how she came about to be arrested, obviously somebody called the cops, but we**
491 **don't know how, or when, or what, well later on in their papers we found out when it happened,**
492 **they admitted what happened, what happened was that she had gone to a company, a car**
493 **dealership, and had purchased a car using the same technique, the process was never completed,**
494 **but in was in process, they had gone a certain length you know, then she went to this other car**
495 **company and she was doing the same thing buying a couple of cars for her friends, well it**
496 **turned out that it was the same company, but a different name, they had their company and then**
497 **they had two DBAs, they had two doing business as, and so with the two separate companies**
498 **well when the paperwork came through they recognized the name and so the first company was**
499 **the moving force, it was the force that resulted in the second company calling the cops and**
500 **bringing them in, but you see it was the same question, they didn't follow the procedure, and**
501 **because they didn't follow the procedure the cheque appeared to be no good, but it was a private**
502 **cheque, if you don't follow procedure it's not going to work [Audience Member: "... just didn't**
503 **know how to do this..."] i suggest that if somebody is going to hold these people to the gamer**
504 **plan what they should do it type up a little instruction sheet saying specifically "here's what you**
505 **do" and hand it to them because otherwise, you know when you talk to people whatever you say**
506 **is words to the wind, you know they blow away and how do you prove you said what you said,**
507 **so you really should have a printed instruction sheet where you say look here's the steps you**
508 **have to go through to make this work [Audience Member says something inaudible] yeah**
509 **basically the whole concept of redemption [Audience Member: "the closed cheques are good**
510 **because of what they did with the trading with the enemy's act and so forth when they went off**
511 **the gold standard, those cheque have to be routed to the treasury first, the treasury has to**
512 **release the funds, it's a process and they should have had instructions, perhaps they overlooked**
513 **that but those cheques have to be honoured by the treasury because of the bankruptcy it's the**
514 **same as a bill of exchange and they have to put that on deposit and release the funds once it**
515 **reaches the proper parties at the treasury"] well of course what's happening, this whole**
516 **approach is viewed as an attack on the banks by the banks, so basically they don't want this**
517 **thing to get out of control, coz if they do, that whole phony thing will collapse, so they'll have to**
518 **go back to real money heaven forbid [Audience Member: "what they're really afraid of is the**
519 **debt will disappear and these bastards will be out of business"] yeah that's basically what we**
520 **just said [Audience Member: "when you write those private cheques, there's no debt behind it,**
521 **it cancels debt, they don't want that because the freaking Pope can't survive"] [Audience**

522 Member: "...make a mistake...!?"] well i think the mistake was not giving them the private
523 instructions, that's just my own personal opinion you know because had she given the the
524 printed instructions the next question would be well did you follow the instructions, and if they
525 say no, no case, that's it you see... well anyway that's an afterthought right now we're not
526 dealing with the before-thought;] offered to sell two automobiles to
527 counterclaimant Aurora. Aurora agreed to buy the automobiles
528 but informed Land Doe that she would not take actual possession
529 of the automobiles until the paper transactions were completed.
530 All paperwork and funding of the transaction would be completed
531 before she would accept the automobiles from Land Doe or Land
532 Rover South Bay. The reason for not taking possession of the
533 property is that full payment would be in the form of a private
534 check rather than a public bank check. (A private check requires
535 special private banking procedures. No actual transfer of
536 possession would or may take place until said procedures are
537 completed. Failure to follow said procedures voids the
538 transaction in its entirety.) [NGLL: it's our agreement, and in their demurrers
539 they admitted it's all true;]

540 8. Land Doe and Aurora commenced to fill out the paperwork. Before
541 completing all the paperwork and the contract negotiation, the
542 Redondo Beach Police Department officers appeared. On
543 information and belief, [NGLL: see whenever you're making up an affidavit, which
544 is what this is, it isn't just a complaint, it's a *verified complaint*, or in other words it's an
545 *affidavit*, also known as a *declaration*, so whenever you make it up, sometimes you have to
546 guess at the information, coz sometimes you really don't know, so in order to cover it, what you
547 say is that "*on information and belief*", that's a very commonly used phrase, to say on
548 information and belief, that way you're putting it in with the facts, but you're really just
549 testifying as to your own state of mind, you have information, you have a certain belief, that's
550 fair game to testify to [Audience Member: "...counterclaimant reserves the right to amend any
551 part or portion of that...!?"] no, no, that's another thing, i see that a lot, where they want to
552 reserve the right to amend and so forth, don't do that because basically when you put in a
553 reservation like that, then you're not making full testimony, a sovereign wouldn't do that,
554 besides *if you get new information you can always amend* it, there's no reason to waffle on that
555 [Audience Member: "well a lot of times they block you from getting the record that's why i use
556 that in mine because they block you from getting the official records and you have to sue out to
557 get to those records"] sure-sure, ok anyhow...] counterclaimant Aurora alleges
558 that Land Doe, Land Rover South Bay, or someone acting with
559 their knowledge and approval, summoned the Redondo Beach Police
560 Department police officers. [NGLL: now on the police report we found out that
561 the arresting officer had badge "1168" and his name was "JOHNSON", now that's all the
562 information we had about him, so this is a form of John Doe, we don't know who he is but we
563 have enough identifying information in that we were able to label him as "1168 JOHNSON", so
564 that's what we did, *remember you don't have to know the names of the other parties, all you
565 have to do is describe what they did, and put a label on them*, we could have called him
566 "Kidnapper number 1" you know... that would have been fine, but we chose to call him "1168
567 JOHNSON" because that is exactly what was on the official report that they had at the police
568 department; (01:51:45)]

569 9. "1168 JOHNSON" is identified as the "ARRESTING OFFICER" in
570 Exhibit "C", the Redondo Beach Police Department Booking and
571 Arrest Report. Under color of law "1168 JOHNSON" assumed the
572 jurisdiction and unlawfully and forcibly carried counterclaimant

573 Aurora away, and imprisoned [NGLL: this should have said imprisoned her against
574 her will;] against her will without thorough investigation, without
575 good cause, and for reasons that to this date are still unknown
576 to her. [NGLL: now there's another technique, look you don't have to know why they did
577 something, if you do a habeas corpus one of the things that the rules say is that you need to say
578 why it is that you're incarcerated, and then the rules continue on to say "*if knowon*"... (lol) so
579 don't fall into the trap of playing a part of their attorney, as far as i'm concerned they need to
580 explain themselves, i don't have to explain to them why they do things, in fact i'm not qualified
581 to explain why they do things, so that's what we said right here "*for reasons that to this date
582 are still unknown to her*", and understand they admitted in their demurer that they did not
583 conduct a thorough investigation... (lol) see how this case is building up...!? now when i say
584 they admitted it, i'm not saying that they actually wrote on that point, but *the very definition of
585 a demurer, is that you agree to all the facts, you're only arguing the law*, so every factual thing
586 that i read here, they admitted to when they filed the demurer, even if they didn't talk about it, as
587 a matter of fact let's just take a quick side-step here the judges wrote in their demurer, and it was
588 real interesting what they said in their demurer and we quoted them pointing out that *the
589 demurer represents an agreement to the facts, they provided the case law themselves*... (lol) so
590 we're saying they did nothing to prove their jurisdiction, they admitted it, and now they want
591 immunity in spite of that, but in their own papers they admitted it, anyway, now when the
592 complaint was filed, the way criminal process starts up is that somebody, anybody can go up to
593 a judge and swear to the facts that this act was done, and this law was violated, and that there's a
594 crime committed, anybody can do that, normally the prosecutor does it, and in fact if somebody
595 who's not a prosecutor does it, there will be a lot of resistance on the part of the judge to give
596 you the acknowledgement you should have, but anybody can go up to a judge, and let him know
597 that a crime was committed and then he can order that it be investigated and prosecuted, so what
598 happened was that somebody, we don't know who yet, eventually we'll find out, but somebody
599 appeared before the judge, and made out an affidavit saying that these crimes had occurred and
600 needed to be prosecuted, the thing is that we couldn't read the signature on the verified
601 complaint, and it was not type-written, and nobody in the prosecutor's office would tell us who
602 that was even though they knew who it was, so what do you do...!? well what we could do is
603 sue, and go through discovery and all that, but we didn't do that coz frankly that takes effort, or
604 we're lazy, not really lazy but it's a reasonable amount of effort, so what we did is we gave him
605 a name, we said complainer Doe did this, "*complainer Doe is the person who signed exhibit
606 "D"*";] One of the officers involved in the unlawful imprisonment
607 commented that this did not seem like a real fraud situation to
608 him.

609 10. Under color of law, "1168 JOHNSON" assumed the jurisdiction to
610 impose various charges to subject counterclaimant Aurora to
611 double jeopardy.

612 11. Complainer Doe is the person who signed Exhibit "D" "FELONY
613 COMPLAINT". Under color of law, Complainer Doe assumed
614 jurisdiction to continue the imprisonment of counterclaimant
615 Aurora. Counterclaimant Aurora is informed and believes that
616 Complainer Doe is either suing as a persona named "People of the
617 State of California," or is suing in the name of another whose
618 name is "People of the State of California." [NGLL: you see the
619 complaint was the people vs. Aurora right...! now our philosophy is this: we claim they never
620 had jurisdiction, so it was not the people against Aurora, it wasn't the state against Aurora, what
621 we had was a bunch of loose cannons out here who under colour of law are pretending, so this is
622 a personal lawsuit from beginning to end, the state is not involved, so what we did is we said
623 here's some person, we don't know who he is, but we've assigned him the name "Complainer

624 Doe” and “Complainer Doe” has another name, he also calls himself “People of the State of
625 California”, that’s his other name, so we never admitted that the state was a party to the action,
626 we identified him right here that we’re informed and believe “that Complainer Doe is either
627 suing as a persona named “People of the State of California,”” that’s his other name, “or he’s
628 suing in the name of” someone else, now *under law you cannot sue in the name of the other*, if
629 i see somebody beat you up, i cannot sue the offender and try to get compensation for your
630 injuries, *you have to sue yourself in your own name*, so you can’t sue in the name of another,
631 so whatever this person is doing we don’t know if it’s his real name “People of the State of
632 California” or if he’s suing in the name of someone else, either way he’s disqualified, so this is
633 just a personal lawsuit against some other personal person;]

634 **12. Exhibit “D” contains various accusations against counterclaimant**
635 **Aurora. Counterclaimant Aurora is informed and believes that**
636 **each of the counterdefendants, (especially Land Rover South Bay,**
637 **Land Doe, Federal Credit Union, FCU Doe, Mercedes Benz South**
638 **Bay, Mercedes Doe, Quaker City Bank, and Quaker Doe) is acting**
639 **in concert with Complainer Doe. In the alternative, each of the**
640 **counterdefendants is an adverse unwilling co-counterclaimant who**
641 **should have an interest as a result of being involuntarily**
642 **included in Exhibit “D”, under color of law, as a named victim.**
643 [NGLL: now you see there are times in a lawsuit, there are times when you’ve been injured and
644 someone else has been injured, and that someone else, now you cannot sue in that other person’s
645 name if he has been injured, but what you can do, you can say this person is important to my
646 case, this person has an interest in the outcome of this case, and this person should be right by
647 my side suing with me, but he’s not, and because he’s not right by my side suing with me, i’m
648 naming him as a defendant, specifically an unwilling co-plaintiff, and so you can drag
649 somebody in kicking and screaming in this case and he’s got to justify himself, because
650 remember this: you named him as a defendant, and if he doesn’t play ball with you, he becomes
651 liable, because what’s going on...!? if he should be in there fighting the battle, and he doesn’t
652 he’s just making it harder for you, he’s aiding the enemy isn’t he, so you can in a lawsuit
653 include an unwilling co-plaintiff, you see that person and he should be right there by your side
654 with his sword drawn just alongside with you, and he’s not, name him as a defendant, an
655 unwilling co-plaintiff [Audience Member: “*what about let’s say it’s a case of a spouse that you*
656 *know has been injured and scared to go after the damaged party*”] well are you injured?
657 [Audience Member: “*absolutely*”] ok then if you’re injured, yes you can bring your spouse in,
658 i’m not sure that’s the best solution to a marriage however... (lol) sometimes these theories
659 don’t work, but yeah you can bring anybody who shares in this responsibility, who shares in the
660 injury, and should be with you, if they’re not with you their against you, and that’s pretty
661 simple, so i just wanted you to be aware of that technique, i hope you guys are learning
662 something out of this, and getting what you came for;] **Said adverse unwilling co-**
663 **counterclaimants are Land Rover South Bay, Land Doe, Federal**
664 **Credit Union, FCU Doe, Mercedes Benz South Bay, Mercedes Doe,**
665 **Quaker City Bank, and Quaker Doe. [NGLL: you know how these people have**
666 **been injured...!? very simple, they could have sold a car, the whole reason for this court process**
667 **is we got to sort this out, we really had partial information, we weren’t really sure who was who**
668 **and what’s what, we knew she was negotiating with Land Rover, we knew that cops don’t just**
669 **show up out of nowhere, so either they called or somebody in concert with them called, or**
670 **somebody’s interfering with the contract, interfering with the deal, so whatever it is, it attacks**
671 **the interests, or involves the interests of Land Rover, so we include them;]**

672 **13. On Exhibit “D” Amy-Hannah Broersma provided the signature which**
673 **authorized Complainer Doe to proceed. [NGLL: if you look on the form, it’s**
674 **true that there was a complainer but that’s just to make it official, but he does have a job and he**

675 has to keep the boss happy, so in every organization they have controls, and so this paper got the
676 approval of the supervisor, so we sued the supervisor is basically what it amounts to, so Amy-
677 Hanna Broersma got named as the supervisor because she provided the authorizing signature
678 that, coz the complainer could not move forward with it without his boss's approval; (02:06:13)]
679 Amy-Hanna Broersma could have stopped Complainer Doe at that
680 point, but apparently acted in concert with Complainer Doe to
681 continue the imprisonment of counterclaimant Aurora. [NGLL: so that's
682 how we made the boss responsible;]

683 14. On Exhibit "D" Grady Miles is named as the Redondo Beach PD
684 "I/O", [NGLL: "I/O" is investigating officer;] and apparently is acting in
685 concert with Complainer Doe to continue the imprisonment of
686 counterclaimant Aurora who is informed and believes that Grady
687 Miles is acting for that purpose. [NGLL: btw Grady Miles defaulted; so did
688 Complainer Doe, what we did, when we served the papers at the District Attorney's office we
689 knew he had to work there right...!? had to be a District Attorney that was doing the
690 complaining... well the person who's apparently in charge of the office, the person who is
691 receiving all the service for all these DAs we did name, this person would not... she admitted
692 she knew who he was but would not say who she was, or who he was, ok...!? so she's hiding
693 information from us, so basically we said well here you are, he's served you're responsible, and
694 that is a legitimate service technique, now she has that responsibility to deliver that paperwork
695 to the right person, ultimately if that person does not respond, if that person defaults, because
696 they were properly served, the one who failed to turn the paper over now becomes responsible,
697 and the person that defaulted, now has a cause of action against that individual, so we can
698 collect from him and through him collect from the person who failed to deliver the paperwork,
699 on the other hand we also suspect that the person who took the paperwork was the one who
700 signed the complaint and that was why it was throwing up such a strong barrier, again we don't
701 know, but we have the basis covered, btw way Complainer Doe defaulted, it's ok with us, we
702 don't mind defaults; (02:09:08)]

703 15. The California 1879 Constitution defines all California courts to be courts of record.³ On or
704 about July 1, 2004, counterclaimant Aurora was involuntarily brought before a court not of
705 record and also not a nisi prius court. Exhibit "E" contains a true and correct copy of the official
706 record of the said court. Thomas R. Sokolov acted as a tribunal and magistrate. Paulette
707 Paccione acted as a district attorney. Counterclaimant Aurora objected to the jurisdiction of the
708 court and the appointment of John P. Torelli as her public defender. Counterdefendants
709 Sokolov, Paccione, and Torelli, without proof of jurisdiction, each ignored Aurora's objections,
710 and proceeded under color of law to continue her imprisonment. At no time has
711 counterclaimant Aurora ever entered a voluntary plea. [NGLL: now btw you brought up
712 whenever you brought up the point that you have the 1849 and 1879 constitutions it doesn't
713 matter, neither constitution applies to us, but the constitutions to apply to them, the current scam
714 is that the 1879 constitution is the constitution, well guess what you can hold them to that,
715 ok...!? and if it works to your favour all the better... well look what the constitution says, it says:
716 "*Article 6 Judicial, Sec. 1. The judicial power of this State is vested in the Supreme Court,
717 courts of appeal, superior courts, and municipal courts, all of which are courts of record.*"
718 cool... what's a court of record...!? well one of the things it is, is a court proceeding according
719 to the common law isn't it...!? all the judges are magistrates, they're not allowed to make any
720 decisions, cool... so you see, what we're saying here is, we're bringing this to the forefront,
721 now let me explain the arraignment process, see all the courts are courts of record, that means
722 proceeding against the common law, in a court of record they cannot say, Joe Blog you are
723 accused of violating, penal code so and so, why...!? because in a court of record which is
724 common law, there's no statutes, there's no codes, ok...!? so they cannot make an accusation
725 like that against you, so what they do is they get you in front of the court and they say that you

726 violated penal code, or you're accused of violating penal code, section so and so, how do you
727 plea? and they inform you of the three choices: **1. guilty, 2. not guilty, or 3. no contest**, ok...!?
728 well in each case when you plead guilty, or not guilty, or not contest, what are you doing...!?
729 you're saying: **1. yes i violated it, 2. no i didn't violate it, or 3. i'll let you decide whether or not**
730 **i violated it**, but in all three cases you're agreeing to the validity of that statute, well there's a
731 fourth choice you can make which is **i don't agree to it, that's not even the issue, i'm not**
732 **gonna let you break out of the common law mould and go into special rules**, ok...! so they're
733 kind of stuck, the whole purpose of arraignment is to get you contracted into agreeing to
734 working according to those rules, if you don't agree, they got a problem [Audience Member:
735 "they get you to do that by getting you to understand on the charges"] do you understand, do
736 you stand under the charges...!? yeah that's right, they do do that, do you understand...!? no i
737 don't stand under them, [Audience Member: "do you...!?"] yeah well the judge does, he has an
738 obligation to obey those rules but they don't; and you'll notice that there is nothing in the
739 constitution as far as i can tell that authorizes statutory courts, they're all courts of record and
740 that's what we're holding them to, now if they're not a court of record, if they're not proceeding
741 according to the court of record, then that makes them what's called a special court and let's
742 jump to that because that's a very important concept, and believe it or not a nisi prius court is a
743 court that you get into because you failed to object, she was objecting, so they did not have a
744 legitimate nisi prius court, ok check out these footnotes here from the "**2005-08-22 –**
745 **Mandamus-motion-v1**" document, now this is really important, stick around for this one, just
746 for a moment if you would, coz this is really important, you all know that the state ??? of
747 California courts are called superior courts but i want you to understand something, that's only a
748 name, it doesn't have any meaning, a true superior court is a court of record, if it's not a superior
749 court, if it's not a court of record then it's operating according to statutes, those statutes
750 constitute special rules, in other words the jurisdiction is granted by these rules, it's defined by
751 these rules and they run according to those rules, and they make charges, or whatever they do is
752 all in accordance with these special rules, because they are special rules it is an inferior court,
753 the true superior court encompasses the whole world, it is unlimited jurisdiction, the special
754 rules define the special court which is operating according to those rules, in other words the
755 criminal court cannot judge a civil matter, the civil court cannot judge a criminal matter because
756 they're limited in jurisdiction by their rules, neither one, the criminal court cannot take into
757 account civil issues and vice versa, it's only a court of record that can take everything into
758 account, so this court of record is a superior court, the court going according to the special rules
759 that's an inferior court, now the difference between the two, both courts really seem about the
760 same in how they operate, but the difference is this, is the inferior court whatever it does,
761 whatever decisions it makes, whatever procedures it follows, they are not presumed to be valid,
762 now they're not also presumed to be invalid, but the point is they don't carry this presumption of
763 validity, a common law court takes everything into account, it has access to all the information,
764 all the philosophies, everything, therefore it's decisions are presumed to be valid, now what's
765 the difference between presuming valid and presuming not to be valid..."? the difference is this,
766 in a superior court if you wanna challenge the decision of a superior court, you have to take the
767 record and go to an even higher court, the appellate court in order to get things fixed, compare
768 that to an inferior court, in an inferior court the decision are not presumed to be valid they are
769 subjected to what's called collateral attack in other words attack from the side, in other words
770 you can sue the inferior court in a superior court, a fresh new lawsuit, that court is wrong
771 because they screwed up, whatever you wanna say, whatever is the case, they came to a bad
772 decision and you're suing that court in order to fix that decision and you're doing it in another
773 court namely the court of record, so that's the difference between the two, you can fix an
774 inferior court by suing it in a superior court, but the only way you can fix a superior court
775 decision is by appeal and then they have to go by what the record says, and the only way that the
776 appellate court can fix a lower court's decision is if the record shows that it was acting in an
777 inferior capacity anyway, so here's the actual case law, it says right here note 5: "**“Inferior**
778 **courts” are those whose jurisdiction is limited and special and whose proceedings are not**
779 **according to the course of the common law.” Ex Parte Kearny, 55 Cal. 212; Smith v.**

800 **Andrews, 6 Cal. 652**”; also it says here note 6: **““The only inherent difference ordinarily**
801 **recognized between superior and inferior courts is that there is a presumption in favor of**
802 **the validity of the judgments of the former, none in favor of those of the latter, and that a**
803 **superior court may be shown not to have had power to render a particular judgment by**
804 **reference to its record. Ex parte Kearny, 55 Cal. 212. Note, however, that in California**
805 **‘superior court’ is the name of a particular court. But when a court acts by virtue of a**
806 **special statute conferring jurisdiction in a certain class of cases, it is a court of inferior or**
807 **limited jurisdiction for the time being, no matter what its ordinary status may be.**
808 **Heydenfeldt v. Superior Court, 117 Cal. 348, 49 Pac. 210; Cohen v. Barrett, 5 Cal. 195” 7**
809 **Cal. Jur. 579”** all of those cases were taken out of volume 7 of California Jurisprudence page
810 579, so that’s really an important thing, so i want you to know, there’s a couple of interesting
811 things, have any of you ever been beaten up by an inferior court, you can go to a court of record,
812 common law court and sue them for that decision, and because it’s a common law court, there’s
813 no statute of limitations, there’s no statutes in a common law court, so if you got a burning
814 issue, remember this, the common law court actually is very close to reality, are you still feeling
815 the pain...!/? if you’re still feeling the pain, then you must have a cause of action, it’s how the
816 common law court works, so those are not dead issues, all these cases, [Audience Member: “*ok*
817 *the only thing i was gonna bring up was that last case that i’d read about that any court that is*
818 *being ruled that is using a statute as its foundation for bringing a case against you is an inferior*
819 *court” that’s exactly right [Audience Members: “do you know of any common law courts that*
820 *are set up here in California...!?” yeah this one (02:22:27)]*

801 **16.** On or about July 16, 2004, counterclaimant Aurora was involuntarily brought before a court not
802 of record and not a nisi prius court. Exhibit “E” contains a true and correct copy of the official
803 record of the said court. Laura C. Ellison acted as a tribunal and magistrate. Jodi Michelle Link
804 acted as a district attorney. Counterclaimant Aurora objected to the jurisdiction of the court and
805 the appointment of Eileen C. Butko as her public defender. Counterdefendants Ellison, Link,
806 and Butko, without proof of jurisdiction, each ignored Aurora’s objections, and proceeded under
807 color of law to continue her imprisonment, this time for the stated purpose to declare “a doubt as
808 to the mental competence of the defendant.” Eileen C. Butko did not defend counterclaimant
809 Aurora. Instead, the record shows that Butko joined in with Ellison and Link to deprive Aurora
810 of her liberty and to continue her imprisonment. The proceeding and subsequent imprisonment
811 is reminiscent of the cooperation between the KGB and courts of Russia against anyone who fell
812 into the government’s disfavor: psychology was the tool used to confine Russian citizens for
813 decades.

814 **17.** On or about August 6, 2004, counterclaimant Aurora was involuntarily brought before a court
815 not of record also not a nisi prius court. Exhibit “E” contains a true and correct copy of the
816 official record of the said court. Mark S. Arnold acted as a tribunal and magistrate. Lisa V.
817 Houle acted as a district attorney. Counterclaimant Aurora objected to the jurisdiction of the
818 court and the appointment of Eileen C. Butko and agent Gregg Hayata as her public defender.

³ California Constitution, Article 6 Judicial, Sec. 1. The judicial power of this State is vested in the Supreme Court, courts of appeal, superior courts, and municipal courts, all of which are courts of record.

819 Counterdefendants Arnold, Houle, and agent Hayata, without proof of jurisdiction, each ignored
820 Aurora’s objections, and proceeded under color of law to continue her imprisonment at the
821 request of Butko’s agent Hayata. Butko’s agent Hayata did not defend counterclaimant Aurora.
822 Instead, the record shows that Hayata joined in with Arnold and Houle to deprive Aurora of her
823 liberty and to continue her imprisonment. Further, a habeas corpus from the court of Aurora
824 was summarily dishonored by Arnold because “it is permature” (sic).

- 825 **18.** On or about August 9, 2004, counterclaimant Aurora was involuntarily brought before a court
826 not of record also not a nisi prius court. Exhibit “E” contains a true and correct copy of the
827 official record of the said court. Laura C. Ellison acted as a tribunal and magistrate. Lisa V.
828 Houle acted as a district attorney. Counterclaimant Aurora objected to the jurisdiction of the
829 court and the appointment of Eileen C. Butko as her public defender. Counterdefendants
830 Ellison, Houle, and Butko, without proof of jurisdiction, each ignored Aurora’s objections, and
831 proceeded under color of law to continue her imprisonment. Further, Eileen C. Butko did not
832 defend counterclaimant Aurora. Further, a habeas corpus from the court of Aurora was
833 summarily dishonored by Ellison.
- 834 **19.** On or about August 24, 2004, counterclaimant Aurora was involuntarily brought before a court
835 not of record also not a nisi prius court. Exhibit “E” contains a true and correct copy of the
836 official record of the said court. Laura C. Ellison acted as a tribunal and magistrate. Lisa V.
837 Houle acted as a district attorney. Counterclaimant Aurora objected to the jurisdiction of the
838 court and the appointment of Eileen C. Butko as her public defender. Counterdefendants
839 Ellison, Houle, and Butko, without proof of jurisdiction, each ignored Aurora’s objections, and
840 proceeded under color of law to continue her imprisonment. Further, Eileen C. Butko did not
841 defend counterclaimant Aurora.
- 842 **20.** On or about September 8, 2004, counterclaimant Aurora was involuntarily brought before a
843 court not of record also not a nisi prius court. Exhibit “E” contains a true and correct copy of
844 the official record of the said court. Laura C. Ellison acted as a tribunal and magistrate. Lisa V.
845 Houle acted as a district attorney. Counterclaimant Aurora objected to the jurisdiction of the
846 court and the appointment of Eileen C. Butko as her public defender. Counterdefendants
847 Ellison, Houle, and Butko, without proof of jurisdiction, each ignored Aurora’s objections, and
848 proceeded under color of law to continue her imprisonment. Further, the record shows that
849 Eileen C. Butko, acting in concert with Houle, never defended counterclaimant Aurora, but did
850 against her wishes “stipulate and declare a doubt as to the mental competence of the defendant.”
- 851 **21.** On or about September 23, 2004, counterclaimant Aurora was involuntarily brought before a
852 court not of record also not a nisi prius court for what appeared to be a mock “mental
853 competence hearing” (i.e. a kangaroo court). Exhibit “F” contains a true and correct copy of the
854 minute order of the said court. John Shepard Wiley Jr acted as a tribunal and magistrate.
855 Cynthia Zuzga’s through agent C. Rose acted as district attorney. Counterclaimant Aurora
856 objected to the jurisdiction of the court and the appointment of Omar Hazel and David Hizami
857 as her public defenders. Counterdefendants Wiley, Zuzga, Rose, Hazel, and Hizami, without
858 proof of jurisdiction, each ignored Aurora’s objections, and proceeded under color of law to
859 continue her imprisonment. Sanjay Sahgal, acting in concert with the Kidnappers, provided
860 documentation form with which to misrepresent the substance before the court not of record.
861 Counterclaimant could plainly see the kangaroo court in action, and, as a lamb in the court of
862 the wolves, saw no point in seriously matching wits with her prisoners. The Minute Order
863 (Exhibit “F”), though not part of the record, confirms the lack of defense effort on the part of
864 Hazel and Hizami. Counterclaimant Aurora is now ordered, by the court not of record, to serve
865 up to 3 year’s imprisonment (through September 8, 2007). The Russian psychological model
866 for bypassing due process was successfully executed by the Kidnappers.
- 867 **22.** Because of the actions committed with actual and implied force or the lack of action of the
868 counterdefendants, counterclaimant was immediately and directly injured and suffered loss of
869 liberty, and imprisoned under color of law.
- 870 **23.** Counterdefendants have a duty to not cause counterclaimant Aurora to be imprisoned under
871 color of law, to not cause loss of liberty. Further, counterdefendants have a duty to prove
872 jurisdiction when objection to jurisdiction is asserted.

- 873 **24.** Counterdefendants have breached that duty,
- 874 **25.** The damages for the injury caused by counterdefendants' actions are \$50,000 for each day of
875 unlawful imprisonment.
- 876 **26.** The damages for the injury caused by counterdefendants' absence of required action is \$5,000
877 for each failure to act.

878 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION – TRESPASS ON THE CASE**

- 879 **27.** Paragraphs 1 through 27 of FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION are included by reference as though
880 fully stated herein.
- 881 **28.** By right, counterclaimant reasonably expects to proceed without injury, secure in her capacities.
882 By right, counterclaimant reasonably expects to exercise her right to negotiate and to enter a
883 contract.
- 884 **29.** Counterdefendants have a legal duty to use due care and not cause an injury to Plaintiff or
885 interfere with said rights in any way.
- 886 **30.** Counterdefendants breached that duty by proximately or legally, directly and indirectly, causing
887 the injuries to Plaintiff.
- 888 **31.** The damages claimed are all a result of the injuries.

889 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION – TRESPASS ON THE CASE**

890 **VICARIOUS LIABILITY**

- 891 **32.** Paragraphs 1 through 27 of FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION are included by reference as though
892 fully stated herein.
- 893 **33.** Power is never without responsibility. And when authority derives in part from Government's
894 thumb on the scales, the exercise of that power by private persons becomes closely akin, in
895 some respects, to its exercise by Government itself.
- 896 **34.** The purpose of imposing vicarious liability is to insure the costs of injuries resulting from
897 defective actions are placed on the source of the actions and others who make the actions
898 possible rather than on injured persons who are powerless to protect themselves. For a
899 counterdefendant to be vicariously liable it must play an integral and vital part in the overall
900 production and promotion activity so that the actor is in a position to affect others or, at the very
901 least, it must provide a link in the chain of exposing the ultimate victim to the actor. The
902 vicariously liable counterdefendant must be in the business of controlling, leasing, bailing, or
903 licensing the actors.
- 904 **35.** Each counterdefendant is an agent of the other, and each has his place in the chain of exposing
905 counterplaintiff Aurora to the actors. Each counterdefendant is vicariously liable for each
906 instance of injury to counterplaintiff.

907 **LAW OF THE CASE**

- 908 **36.** Exhibit "G" is incorporated by reference as though fully stated herein.

909 **REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

910 **37.** For that cause of action therefore Plaintiff brings her suit.

911 **38.** WHEREFORE, Counterclaimant requests relief and judgment against Counterdefendants as
912 follows:

913 **39.** WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays judgment against Defendants, and each of them, as follows:
914
915 On all causes of action:

916 **40.** For general damages in the sum of \$50,000 multiplied by the number of days in constructive
917 and actual imprisonment;

918 **41.** For loss of earnings according to proof;

919 **42.** That the court enter a declaratory judgment that counterdefendants have acted arbitrarily and
920 capriciously, have abused their discretion and have acted not in accordance with law, but under
921 color of law;

922 **43.** That the court enter a declaratory judgment that counterdefendants have acted contrary to
923 constitutional right, power or privilege.

924 **44.** That the court enter a declaratory judgment that counterdefendants' actions were in excess of
925 statutory jurisdiction, authority and short of statutory right.

926 **45.** That the court permanently enjoin counterdefendants from interfering in any way with
927 counterclaimant's lawful right to negotiate and enter into contracts;

928 **46.** That the court enter a declaratory judgment that the records of the court not of record are
929 impeached for want of jurisdiction in the Court or judicial officers, for collusion between the
930 parties, and/or for fraud in the parties offering the record, in respect to the proceedings;

931 **47.** That the court grant counterclaimant her attorneys fees;

932 **48.** That the court grant counterclaimant such other and further relief as the court deems proper;

933 **49.** For interest as allowed by law; and

934 **50.** For costs of suit incurred.

935 **51.** I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing facts are true and correct to the best of my
936 knowledge

937 **52.** THE COURT [for an order **not for a claim**]

938 November 1, 2004, County of Los Angeles, California
939
940 THE COURT

941
942

by Aurora Bautista Quicho