

Jurisdiction:

1. Power of a court to adjudicate cases and issue orders.
2. Territory within which a court or government agency may properly exercise its power. See, e.g. *Ruhrgas AG v. Marathon Oil Co. et al.*, 526 U.S. 574 (1999). Cite.

From the Cornell Law School:

The term jurisdiction is really synonymous with the word “power”. Any court possesses jurisdiction over matters **only to the extent granted to it by the Constitution**, or legislation of the sovereignty on behalf of which it functions.

Exculpatory evidence is [evidence](#) favourable to the [defendant](#) in a [criminal trial](#) that exonerates or tends to exonerate the defendant of [guilt](#).^[1] It is the opposite of [inculpatory evidence](#), which tends to prove guilt.

In many countries, including the [United States](#), [police](#) and [prosecutors](#) are required to disclose to the defendant **exculpatory evidence** they possess before the [defendant](#) enters a plea (guilty or not guilty).

The courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. They possess only that power authorized by the Constitution, see *Willy v. Coastal Corp.*, 503 U. S. ___, ___ (1992) (slip op., at 4-5); *Bender v. Williamsport Area School Dist.*, [475 U.S. 534](#), 541 (1986), **which is not to be expanded by judicial decree**, *American Fire & Casualty Co. v. Finn*, [341 U.S. 6](#) (1951). **It is to be presumed that a cause lies outside this limited jurisdiction**, *Turner v. President of Bank of North America*, 4 Dall. 8, 11 (1799), **and the burden of establishing the contrary rests upon the party asserting jurisdiction**, *McNutt v. General Motors Acceptance Corp.*, [298 U.S. 178](#), 182-183 (1936). [Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins.](#) (93-263), 511 U.S. 375 (1994)

Brady Disclosure consists of [exculpatory](#) or [impeaching](#) information and evidence that is material to the guilt or innocence or to the punishment of a defendant. The term comes from the [U.S. Supreme Court](#) case [Brady v. Maryland](#),^[1] in which the Supreme Court ruled that suppression by the prosecution of evidence favourable to a defendant who has requested it violates [due process](#).

Alleging that someone violated a code or Act, is not proof it applies in the first place, they are two separate claims. You cannot prove a rule was violated until after you prove it applies in the first place.

The prosecutor needs to prove with **'facts in evidence'** that the 'Act' applies.

The prosecutor violates the fundamental rule, known to every lawyer, that an argument is limited to **the facts in evidence**. (*United States v. Fearn*, 501 F.2d 486, 489 (7th Cir.1974))

If a prosecutor does not have **evidence**, he is committing “Prosecutorial Misconduct” by going outside of the “evidence”

The judge/court is not allowed to let you submit a plea without you being fully informed and in full knowledge of what you are pleading to. Their rules. So while you are asking questions of clarity, means you are not yet fully informed. As soon as you switch to make a statement, it indicates you are clear and ready to go to trial. Don't stop asking for clarity or questions of clarifying nature. **Don't make statements or assertions.** The only assertions you should make is repeating ones made by the Judge, Prosecutor or the arresting Law Enforcement Officer, to get it on record and clear to everyone. This will often lead to them realising that they have overstepped the mark, and we all know what happens to a cornered animal.

You: I have an unsigned plea of guilty here with me today that I am willing to sign, as soon as I have some **clarity** on some issues. I just have some **clarifications**. Do I have the right to know the cause and nature of these proceedings?

Judge: You have the ticket in front of you. It's all been explained. You violated the law. How do you plea?

You: I'm just trying to **clarify**. Do I have the right to be informed of the cause and nature of these proceedings here today?

Judge: Absolutely sir. You have the ticket and it has been explained all right in front of you.

You: Thank you sir, just making note of that, and ticking off my question with your answer as 'Yes' Excellent! Am I **presumed innocent** of that accusation here today?

Judge: Of course sir.

You: Outstanding! I will mark that as Yes. Am I **presumed innocent of every element** of this accusation here today?

Judge: Sir, I'm not here to hear your colloquially, if you want to fight this I suggest you take this to trial, I just want to hear your plea. Do you plead guilty or not guilty?

You: My intention is to plead guilty here today. I'm just trying to **clarify** some things here today. For **clarification** I'll read that again. Am I **presumed innocent of every element** of the accusation here today?

Judge: Absolutely!

You: Good. (and tick that off on your notes) Is jurisdiction one of the element that I'm presumed innocent of here today?

Jurisdiction may be brought up at any point during legal proceedings. They may try to badger you into dropping that question. Don't let them. {Because this is taken from an American role play, we need to find it in our RSA Constitution and you can cite it if they continue to skirt the question. I have not yet had the time to look it up}

Judge: Ok I see where we are going with this and yes we have jurisdiction, I assure you.

You: Thank you. So, yes, jurisdiction is one of the elements I'm presumed innocent of here today.

Judge: Sir, can we move on. I just told you. We have jurisdiction and I really want to get your plea. Right now. You are really trying my patients.

You: I'm just making sure I didn't miss hear you. You said I am presumed innocent of jurisdiction here today, is that correct?

Judge: Sir, I have explained to you that we have jurisdiction and it sounds like you really want to go to trial with this and to be fair, I'll enter a plea of not guilty for you sir?

You: Sorry, my intention is to plead guilty here today, in fact I even have an unsigned plea of guilty right here in front of me. I just have the clarification, which I have just asked, which is to clarify what you just said.

Judge: I can't take a conditional plea and I really need you to plea. There are people behind you and they would like to move forward. It's very clear. We have a ticket right here. This officer issued it, the prosecution has verified it. How do you plea? I'm getting very impatient.

You: Clearly you are sir. My intention is to plead guilty, just as soon as I have clarity on a simple point that I just asked, that I am presumed innocent of jurisdiction.

Judge: Did you just say you wanted to plead guilty? Should I just enter a plea of guilty and we can all go home.

You: I'm just trying to clarify the point that I just asked. Which is, did I hear you correctly in saying Yes, that I am presumed innocent of the element of jurisdiction, here today?

Judge: Sir, we have gone over this jurisdiction. I have ruled on it. I've read your motions, I've ruled on those. I'm not going through this again. You can argue that at trial.

You: I'm not asking to argue anything. At the moment I'm just trying to clarify what you said. And if I heard you correctly. Did I hear you correctly in saying, that I'm presumed innocent of jurisdiction, here today? I'm so sorry if I've miss heard you. 11:25

Judge: I explained to you, that you are presumed innocent. Now how do you plea? It sounds like you really want to go to trial so you can have your day in court. You may want to hire an attorney.

You: On that question I heard you clearly and I have notes on that, that I'm presumes innocent. Thank you very much for that. My question of clarification was; Am I presumed innocent of jurisdiction here today? I'm just trying to clarify if I heard you correctly. Maybe my hearing was impeded at that moment. You seem to not want to restate what I think I may have miss heard; Am I innocent of jurisdiction here today? 12:11

Judge: I've made this decision and if you mention this jurisdiction one more time sir, I really just want to get a plea from you. I've decided the jurisdiction and I'm about to hold you in **contempt of court**. So, if you mention jurisdiction one more time, I'm going to have you arrested. How do you plead sir?

You: If I may just make a note of the topic which I am no longer permitted to safely clarify. I'll write that down. (Say it out loud as you write it) **No longer permitted to safely clarify this topic.**

(Turn it around and state it that here is a topic that I am no longer safely aloud to clarify. I am basically telling the judge, that he forbid me from clarifying the cause and nature of the proceedings and I'm going to bring that up if he asks me if I'm ready to proceed. I'm going to say there is a topic that I'm not permitted to clarify, "If you'll permit me to clarify then we can get on with the proceedings. I am making sure that it's clear, that I have been threatened with violence if I continue clarifying this topic.)

This is another way of doing it:

You: Is it contemptible to ask relevant and unanswered questions about the cause and nature of these proceedings. I no longer feel safe to ask relevant and unanswered questions to proceed.

I no longer use the word jurisdiction.

or if no threat of contempt of court, continue as follows:

The prosecutor slams down a book or Acts and Statutes, and says; "It's right here, the NATIONAL ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATIONS, of August 2000, states that this applies to everyone in the Republic of South Africa"

Judge: So how do you plea? The prosecutor just showed you the facts what is it that you don't understand? The Act there says that this applies to everyone in South Africa. Are you above the law sir?

You: So what you are saying is, the evidence of jurisdiction of this court, in particular about this proceeding is written in that book there?

Judge: That is correct, yes. The prosecutor showed you the Act / Law (Whatever he says)

You: He's shown me the book, perhaps if he can give me a copy of the book and indicate where about in the book I may find these facts, on the issue of jurisdiction. There is a lot of information in the book. Would it be possible if he could limit it to a page or two to begin with. What page would the evidence be on?

Judge: It really sounds like you need to hire a licensed attorney. He can explain all these things to you sir. How do you plea?

You: Will the prosecutor's case be stated for him by this attorney you propose I hire?

Judge: The prosecutor's case is stated. Sir, you really are trying my patience.

You: If I hired an attorney, would this attorney be the one clarifying these answers that the prosecutor is meant to? What is being implied is that I will be getting the answers from the attorney, that the prosecutor should be furnishing about these proceedings here today.

Judge: yes, he will clarify all of that for you sir. Now please, how do you plea?

You: So the prosecutors assertions will be confined to the answers that I will get from this attorney that you propose I hire?

Judge: Sir, your attorney will explain this to you, the law can be very complicated and we really want you to have a fair chance and a fair trial. You should really, really plead not guilty and have a fair trial. Seek an attorney.

You: Your advice is noted but, as I said my intention is to plead guilty here today, and perhaps the burden of stating a case should be on the prosecutor and not upon me to pay an attorney to state his case for him, which is why I have the question; Is there any evidence of jurisdiction that has been provided to the court as yet?

Judge: I have explained to you, the ticket is all I need, and I have jurisdiction.

You: Let me make note that your standard of proof is meant by this ticket and something within it, that I'm trying to discover here. So, your burden of proof was met by some evidence that's within this ticket? Is that correct?

Judge: Sir, I really don't understand what else I need to explain to you. You really need an attorney. Yes we have all the evidence we need. It's right here in the Act, I mean you asked for physical evidence, that a physicist can show you and I've shown it to you. Right there in the Act.

You: Now we're going back to the code. Is this evidence in the ticket or in the code? I just want to know how these codes apply to me?

(Missing audio)

Use the words: "Objection: Point of clarification" whenever you are not clear on something. The judge is trying to keep you from asking these embarrassing questions. He doesn't like them. They hold up his job. They hold up the prosecution. They hold up the profits! They have no good outcome for them. All they want is statement, not you asking questions. **Once you have made an assertion. That indicated you are done needing information.** Once you switch from gathering information to making an assertion, means you are informed enough to take a position. Now that you have taken a position, now it's time for trial.

They tell you, you have a right to be informed, but when you ask the questions, they threaten you with contempt of court. Violence, for asking the very questions that they say you have a right to be informed about.

Again:

You: Is it contemptible to ask relevant and unanswered questions about the cause and nature of these proceedings?

You are still asking relevance of jurisdiction. And where's the evidence.

Am I entitled to a fair and meaningful hearing?

Corpus delicti (Latin: "body of the crime"; plural: corpora **delicti**) is a term from Western jurisprudence referring to the principle that a crime must be proved to have occurred before a person can be convicted of committing that crime.

I have no means to make it to the court.
Innocent people have no undue burden.

To the clerk of the court:

Is there any way that I can achieve justice, without a **burden on me**, to come up with recourses I do not have or may not be able to come up with, to prevent me from going to jail for it? (or to be held in contempt of court) or without a present risk that I may not be able to achieve this and thus be found guilty. What is the mechanism for them to solve this dilemma? They have the burden. It's not your dilemma, it's the courts dilemma. They have to take care of the burden, not you. (But you need to communicate this to them clearly. To the clerk of the court.

This is creating Undue burden

They have to come up with the solution.

When they propose a burden and you happily or grudgingly accept it, it's up to you, when in fact it's up to them. Posing the question to the Clerk, makes it clear that it is not a voluntary burden that you are willing to take on.

The court does have jurisdiction over its statutes and codes (and Acts), that's why they play games with you when you go into court, stating that you are there to challenge their jurisdiction. Good luck with that challenge.

When you are specific about which jurisdiction you are challenging such as *personam* (look it up) and *subject matter*. They change their attitude. They may still try to test you to see if you have any clue as to what you are challenging."

Ask the prosecutor: "What evidence do you have that the Statutes/Act applies to me?"

The prosecutor usually says: "The legislator." or something like that.

Then ask the prosecutor: "Do you have any **Evidence or Witnesses** with firsthand knowledge from the legislator that can testify today, that the Statutes/Act apply to me?"

"So, there is no evidence and no witness?"

Ask the Cop: "Did you file a **verified complaint**?"

The cop usually says, "Yes",

Then ask: "Was the **verified complaint** made upon oath, before any person authorized by law to administer oaths? He usually looks dumbfounded and goes silent, as he stares at the prosecutor, which usually answers some nonsense for him.

Be specific about which jurisdiction you are challenging so that these crooks don't scream at you and tell you to sit down and threaten to lock you up for contempt of court or send you out for a mental evaluation

There is No "State"

Bureaucrats don't kill people for violating "laws." No, no, no. That's barbaric. Bureaucrats only kill people to insure that they stand trial for "breaking" those "laws."

Maybe that is how bureaucrats get past the "cruel and unusual punishment" clause in the "constitutions."

It was not a "punishment" in the "legal" sense. No, it was the natural consequence of his peaceful disobedience.

Before "proceeding" I ask the lawyer, or the "cop," "is there evidence of a complaining party? Just a simple yes or no answer will do." If the judge attempts to interfere on behalf of his cronies, I ask the "judge," "who has the burden of proof here?" "Judges" in traffic courts usually need to be reminded it is supposedly the plaintiff, and not the defendant (us, their victims) that has the burden of proof. If so, I might point out the following rule:

"The judge presiding at the trial may not testify in that trial as a witness. No objection need be made in order to preserve the point." Rule 605, Arizona Rules of Evidence.

Perhaps this is the reason why the rules of evidence were thrown out in "civil traffic cases." Maybe by doing so it permits the judge to testify against me without submitting to cross-examination. The burden of proof is supposed to be on the complaining party "beyond a reasonable doubt" in "criminal cases" and "by a preponderance of the evidence in civil cases.

The judge, consistent with the rules of common sense and fairness, is not permitted to jump in and answer such questions for the plaintiff. This is true even if he does represent the plaintiff. Marcia Clark was not permitted to testify for Kato for goodness sakes. Again, I would ask the judge what is his role in this if he insists on helping (representing) the alleged plaintiff. If he insists on having the "right" to repeatedly jump in and testify then I will remind him of my "right" to cross-examine him. I will also remind him of rule 605.

As previously shown, evidence of a complaining party does not consist of merely having the name of that party such as "the state." If that's all they can or will provide, I will tell them that such an answer is non-responsive to a question which only requires a yes or no answer.

What in the world is so difficult about answering yes or no?

I don't let the cop, judge, or lawyers get off point here. This point is critical in that it does more to expose them than almost anything else I can think of at this point in my experience. That's why I keep asking them even if they tend to get very upset. It is easier to see why this is so important if you look at it this way: imagine you get served with a summons a; complaint from people you have never heard of before. Do you just accept they have standing to complain?

Think about this for a moment, why would politicians get upset just because I am asking for evidence of a complaining party? The reason is because, like the lawyer who said who he was representing was "irrelevant," they know they cannot provide any facts to prove there is a complaining party other than themselves. But who are they? Who are these violent strangers presuming to have the "right" to interfere with my life and that of others without anyone's freely given consent?

[Bureaucrats act on behalf of themselves under a collective alter ego known as "the state;" a thinly concealed protection racket.](#)

I am exposing the fact that the phrase the "State of Arizona," or "City of San Diego" etc., is just an alter ego shared by the cop, the prosecutor and the lawyer representing them both, the pretended "judge." It is merely an idea, a

"mental conception" or fantasy that has no real, tangible existence outside of someone's head. It's just like Santa Claus; yes, people can dress up as Santa Claus, but that doesn't make them Santa Claus. "Santa Claus" is just an idea that may have once seemed very real to you but, as you grew up, it no longer did, and for good reason. There is no "state" and that's why judges refuse to comply with rule 9(a) and such precedent from the "Supreme Court" quoted above: "courts must look behind names that symbolize the parties..." The difference, however, between Santa Claus and the "state" is that no one is using a gun to force me to believe in Santa and, if someone did, they wouldn't be hailed as a hero or honorable.

Other than their guns and an insatiable appetite for violence and domination, the only thing bureaucrats have are their opinions. For example, I once had a judge in Arizona tell me the "State of Arizona" was an "act of congress from 1911." Who was I to argue with her (other than pointing out she was testifying against me on behalf of the cop)? How is an "act of congress" a complaining party? What obligation do I owe, and how did I damage an alleged "act of congress?" Better yet, exactly where, when, why and how was I within or subject to an act of congress?

By her own admission the "State of Arizona" was not the ground. That, however, was the cop's only basis to claim that I was within the state. Do you think the cop was thinking of an act of congress when he testified I was within the state?

"Yeah, this is officer Gruden; I'm observing a white male within an act of congress without ID, send back-up NOW! Lots of back-up."

Even if I were to accept the opinion that the "state" had a tangible existence such as a group of men and women, why should I accept the opinion this cop or some lawyer, represents every one of them? How about their opinion that there was a cause of action against me? How did I damage this group of people? What possible obligations could I have to this group of unidentified people and why? You see? This is why I question everything. The more you examine what these people say and do, the more it falls apart.

The "state" is not a natural phenomenon. It is man-made and exists only in the mind. There are no naturally created "states." They are all artificial. Prior to July 4th, 1776, there were no American "states," there were allegedly American "colonies." The "colonies" were magically transformed into "states" by nothing more than words being scribbled onto pieces of paper called "constitutions." However, unless you believe in childish ideas such as magic, then you know that words on paper create nothing.

Currently (summer 2002), there is a lot of talk about a Palestinian "state" in the Middle East. The land is there and the Palestinians are there, but where is their so-called "state?" A "state" is nothing more than a "state" of mind. A "nation" is nothing more than a hallucination. A "country" is ... starting to get the picture?

You see, merely by asking, "is there evidence of a complaining party?" I am exposing the fact there isn't one, at least, not a tangible one. There's just an illusion in someone's head. In other words: There is no "state."

As I like to put it: can I hit a "state" with a rock? To put the question differently, can I put a "government" in a wheelbarrow? No, I can't. In stark terms, we can destroy the physical infrastructure of a "country" but, if the people remain, the "state" remains because their "country" (group identity) was all in their heads to begin with, not their land. They merely associate their "country" with "their" land. Many think the "state" is the ground, that the geographic landmass "Arizona" is identical in all respects to the "State of Arizona."

This is not only false, this is absurd, and for many reasons. I will provide only one more example. If the "state" were the ground and ONLY the ground (just as a table is just a table and not a book on the table), then the complaining party in a traffic case would be the ground. Now that's insane.

Obviously the "state" is not the ground. A "state" is not geographic or even tangible; if it's anything, then it's political. The shocking reality behind all of this is if evidence could be admitted to prove there is a group of individuals out there who entered into some sort of agreement, there is still no evidence I'm obligated to them or have damaged them in any way.

To think I can somehow damage someone in Page Arizona if I don't have ID on me when driving down the street in Phoenix to get a box of raisins (or other dry fruit) is "patently" insane. Anyone with such a belief would be laughed at as a nutcase. However, put a costume on that same individual, give him a gun, a really cool looking badge, a car with fancy lights on top, and total lack of discretion and personal responsibility and...

That is why I may also ask, "is there evidence of a cause of action against me?" I keep a record of their answers as best I can because the odds are they are going to be non-responsive to each and every question. I also like to point out the contradictions whenever they arise. Being non-responsive is itself proof the so-called "trial" is unfair. As

previously stated, the "Supreme Court" holds the opinion that to satisfy "due process," a hearing must be meaningful. It hardly needs demonstrating that being non-responsive falls far short of being truly "meaningful."

And, on that point, can a "trial" based on violence be "meaningful" to begin with? To then add almost complete non-responsiveness to the violence certainly seems extreme and unnecessary, unless, of course, the "Supreme Court" believes "meaningful" means "sham," "charade," "joke" etc.

Not surprisingly, the judge will usually ignore my questions and pretend I'm not even there. They do this by calling the cop up to the witness stand to testify despite any and all objections I may raise. If you see this in person you'll know, first hand, that these proceedings have nothing to do with fairness.

I have had "cops" admit in depositions they lacked personal knowledge of the facts and "judges" have still permitted them to testify. Indeed, these "trials" resemble a "dog and pony" show, and a bad one at that. I mean, some of these so-called judges don't even give you pretense of fairness, that's how ridiculous they are. No, to them, naked aggression is the rule.

That is why I am never permitted to videotape the proceedings and there is never a reason given despite the fact the rules permit it (even so, in "Legal Land" "judges" don't have to give reasons for anything). It boggles the imagination when you consider that, in the "Mesa City Court," so-called "criminal" proceedings are videotaped every day. Just walk in and you can see several being broadcast in the lobby.

During direct examination, if the persecutor or the judge asks the cop a question that "assumes facts not in evidence," I object on those grounds. This is basically his entire testimony though. There is humor somewhere in there, but I'm not laughing.

Most of the cop's testimony will consist of rambling "time worn" legal opinions such as his seeing me within a pretended "city." Well, unless a "city" is a particular geographic area and nothing else (it's not), then our cop has assumed facts not in evidence. He has also drawn a legal opinion that is supposed to be based upon facts already in evidence. The judge will really expose his true nature if he overrules this objection. It is unfair to permit a witness to assume facts not in evidence. Just ask any lawyer.

A big one is if the lawyer asks the cop a question requiring him to draw a legal opinion or conclusion, such as "did you see Marc commit a crime" or "driving without a license?" This is a very serious glitch in the "system" I've exploited for years. They will always allow the cop to testify he saw me commit a "crime" or violate a so-called "statute." However, if I ask questions any more difficult or probing than that, the lawyer and the judge will run to the rescue of their client (partner) and refuse to allow him to answer any such questions. That's exactly the point of the questions though; to make them run into the corner.

If I object to a question requiring the cop to offer an opinion such as "I saw Marc violate a statute," and the judge overrules that objection, I don't worry because I know the judge will contradict himself later on when it's my turn to "cross-examine" the "cop." The judge is headed for a pretty bad time for allowing the cop to continue giving legal opinions because he has permitted the cop to assume facts not in evidence and has overruled my objection that a question called for a legal conclusion.

My "cross-examination" is geared to taking advantage of these "rulings" by helping the judge back himself into a corner so he will contradict himself and throw out every rule of fairness in his sacred little "law" books. I know from experience that "cops" will not be permitted to answer questions such as "what is a statute?" That is why I deliberately set them up to contradict themselves. Some lawyers have proudly proclaimed the cop doesn't need to know what a "statute" is to prove I "violated" one. Really! Maybe you can also perform brain surgery without knowing the brain is in the skull. Where is the "personal knowledge?" Without the lawyerese, shouldn't the bare minimum for a witness to be credible be that he at least knows what he's talking about?

The point is not to be argumentative, but to get the case thrown out so I can go back to being productive instead of wasting my time with these crooks dressed in suits, robes, and other idiotic uniforms.

RCW 9A.72.010(1) defines a 'materially false statement' as 'any false statement oral or written, regardless of its admissibility under the rules of evidence, which could have affected the course or outcome of the proceeding. The court as a matter of law determines the materiality of a false statement. *State v. Dial*, 44 Wn. App. 11, 14, 720 P.2d 461, review denied, **106 Wn.2d 1016 (1986)** . Here, Beiermann's statements were material.

Our Supreme Court held in *State v. Carpenter*, 130 Wash. 23, 26, 225 P. 654 (1924): It has generally been held by the courts and text writers that testimony upon which a charge of perjury may be based need not necessarily be

concerning, nor directly relevant to, issues made by the pleadings, but it is sufficient for that purpose if it is material to any question that may properly arise in the trial of the case.

Here, the State had the burden of proving that Beiermann's statements in her civil trial deposition were false. This was relevant to the criminal case because the State charged Beiermann with theft. The second count of theft arose from the false statements Beiermann made in her deposition. Beiermann's statements in her deposition were relevant, and the trial court did not err by admitting them.

III. Improperly Admitted Evidence

Beiermann asserts the trial court erred by admitting: (1) the Beiermanns' tax returns; (2) her statement to the effect that she was John Ladenburg's cousin; and (3) proof of insurance payments of \$26,476.76 wrongfully paid to Beiermann's husband arising out of the auto accident where Beiermann had sent a forged letter with Marcus's signature indicating her husband lost wages. The trial court did not err by admitting this evidence.

"The real tragedy is that no court will allow the presentation of facts and evidence when demanded.

To have a judge sit there when a motion to disqualify, the attorney is presented claiming, no license to practice law has been presented by them, and no agency agreement signed by the accused or accuser has been shown to exist, nullifying any authority the attorneys have is a joke.

The Judge stated without any facts presented by the attorneys, that he accepted they had a right to speak, is total BS.

It doesn't matter if you object. ITS A KANGAROO COURT, there is no law, there is no rights. Except what the judge chooses to grant as privileges, and he controls thugs with guns (bailiffs) to carry out his will, while you get treated like a slave.

No system, no matter what can benefit you, if no rules apply to everyone equally, and they can be changed arbitrarily by a man claiming authority (judge) who has NO CONSEQUENCES for violation of the supposed laws. So all presumptions about there being any law evaporate. You can't play and win when there are no rules to play by."