

HIGH COURT TREASON

Treason doesn't get any more extreme than when the High Court of a country is 100% taken over by Traitors.

“Australian Judges are Frauds, Liars, Criminals, Traitors & Fools” is the title of one of my early leaflets (see: <http://www.rightsandwrong.com.au/html/frauds.html>) and this Treachery shows no signs of abating.

There was an Australian People's Grand Jury at Werris Creek late in November 2010, and John Bauskis and I secured “true Bills of Indictment”.

John's is against a NSW Supreme Court Registrar, Leonie Walton, for her making a Judgment that there was “No cause of action” and refusing to file John's Indictment against a NSW Supreme Court Judge, Bruce Meredith James, when he refused John his Right to Trial by Jury for the trial of John's Indictment against another NSW Supreme Court Judge, Alfred George Palmer for Palmer declaring John to be a “Vexatious Litigant”. The trial of Palmer is set for the 25th of February, 2011.

While mine is against a NSW District Court Judge, Christopher John Armitage, for “treason, treachery, perjury, concealing the serious offence of stealing, and perverting the course of justice” in the trial of the Indictment of “THE QUEEN against JOHN WILSON” which is mostly reported in this website under the heading of “TREASON – NOT TRIAL”.

I have an Appeal in the Court of Criminal Appeal regarding that “THE QUEEN against JOHN WILSON” debacle and the new Registrar in that Court, Michael Crompton, is being evasive and kowtowing to the Crown Solicitor to try to find an excuse to dismiss my Appeal without any hearing whatsoever.

John Bauskis has already tried to file for a Writ of Mandamus in the Sydney registry of the High Court of Australia, only to have that Registrar refuse to accept the Application, saying he doesn't have to give any reasons for doing so.

Now, I am about to attempt, similarly, to file in that same Sydney Registry of the High Court of Australia, also for a Writ of Mandamus. I expect the same refusal.

Today (the 8th of December 2010) I had my Affidavit witnessed by a Justice of the Peace at the Parramatta Registry of the Family Court of Australia. This will accompany the “Application for an order to Show Cause”, the “Writ of Mandamus”, the “Summons” and the “Application for Reduction or Partial Waiver of Filing Fees & Hearing Fees”. I will go in on Friday to the Law Courts Building in Queen’s Square, Sydney to present them.

Here follows the Affidavit:-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA
SYDNEY REGISTRY**

No. S of 2010

BETWEEN

John Wilson

and

**The Chief Justice of New South Wales,
The Honourable James Jacob
Spigelman AC**

AFFIDAVIT

I, John Wilson, of 19 Elm Place, North Rocks, NSW 2151, being duly sworn make oath and say as follows:

1. Between the dates of 24 May 2010 and 20 August 2010, a trial was held at the Parramatta Registry of the District Court of New South Wales for the Indictment of “THE QUEEN against JOHN WILSON”. A person named Christopher John Armitage was the “Cor Judge” and twelve unnamed persons were supposed to be a Jury but, because they had no understanding as to their Jurisdiction, they were not the “competent, independent and impartial tribunal” as required by law and, therefore, there was not Trial by Jury (ie: by Law, Right and Oath) by a Jury (ie:

twelve Freeman duly sworn in as Jurors). I truly believe that that “trial” was a comprehensive Miscarriage of Justice because Justice is “the protection of rights and the punishment of wrongs”. I truly believe that Christopher John Armitage had no intention of allowing Justice to prevail... and the transcripts of the proceedings are testimony to that.

Filed by John Wilson, 19 Elm Place, North Rocks, NSW 2151 Ph: 0401 413 650

2. On Friday the 26th day of November 2010, an Australian People’s Grand Jury was convened at the NSW country town of Werris Creek. I presented a proposed Summons to indict Christopher John Armitage of treason, treachery, perjury, concealing the serious offence of stealing, and perverting the course of justice. After due deliberation, debate and questions, a vote was taken that resulted in a unanimous concurrence that there was “a true Bill of Indictment.
3. On Thursday, the 2nd day of December 2010, I attempted to file three documents to initiate the prosecution of Christopher John Armitage in the Sydney Registry of the Supreme Court of New South Wales. Those documents were: (a) the Summons, (b) an Affidavit in support of the Summons, and (c) an Affidavit annexing a copy of the “Record of Grand Jurors Concurring” from that Australian People’s Grand Jury bearing its Common Seal.
4. Because of the repeated instances of Miscarriages of Justices inflicted on me since I first sought the redress of wrongs concerning fraudulent Bank loan contracts, where variable interest rates render a contract void for uncertainty, that have destroyed my livelihood, dispossessed me of my property many times, imprisoned me many time, whilst being g assaulted by Police and Sheriffs, I do not have the financial resources to pay the “Court Fees”. Therefore, I have to apply for a “Waiver of Fees”.
5. I filled in the necessary application for a “Waiver of Fees”, had a Justice of the peace witness my signature, and presented to the Duty Registrar on the 5th floor of the Law Courts Building, Queen’s Square, Sydney.

6. The female Duty Registrar would not “approve” the fee waiver and said she would give a copy of the Summons and two Affidavits to Steve Jupp who would “let (me) know his decision”.
7. A Registrar is a bookkeeper, a clerk in an office, a person who maintains a register. A Registrar has no jurisdiction over a Freeman.
8. There are Three Levels of Jurisdiction according to the Natural Order of Things and they are: Firstly and Divinely, there is THEOCRACY (ie: God Rules) because God is the Creator of all things; Secondly and as Ordained by God, there is DEMOCRACY (ie: People Rule) because Man has been created by God; and Thirdly and Subordinately, there is BUREAUCRACY (ie: Officials Rule) because People have created Offices wherein Officials administer affairs for the welfare and convenience of the People.
9. People cannot rule God, and nor can Officials rule People.
10. The Bill of Rights 1689 literally said, in unmistakable terms, that “evil counsellors, judges and ministers endeavoured to subvert and extirpate the laws and liberties of the realm”.
11. Today, we have a new generation of those same “evil counsellors, judges and ministers” trying to overthrow DEMOCRACY and undermine, obscure and negate THEOCRACY. It is a diabolical strategy by “the sons of Satan who is the father of lies and a murderer from the beginning” (John 8: 44).
12. I truly believe that there is a worldwide movement that is Satanic and Fascist and goes under the guise of the NEW WORLD ORDER (the “N.W.O.” or “NWO”).
13. To implement this NWO, DEMOCRACY has to be destroyed and, to destroy DEMOCRACY, TRIAL BY JURY must be destroyed.
14. I truly believe that the BANKS are the driving corporations in this movement and that they have control over our PARLIAMENTS and our JUDICIARY with the Parliaments passing legislation to take away the People’s Rights and Property,

and with the Judges enforcing those Acts of Parliament upon the People directly.

15. Benito Mussolini, the Italian Dictator who was viciously killed by his own at the end of the Second World War, once said that “Fascism is Corporatism”.
16. I truly believe that the deluge of orchestrated Acts of Parliament, such as the Uniform Civil Procedure Act 2005, are all part of the Advance of Fascism.
17. I truly believe that BUREAUCRATS of all description are being indoctrinated into the N.W.O.
18. I truly believe that lawyers are being indoctrinated into the N.W.O. through the universities and being made to adhere to those dictates by their Law Societies under threat of disbarment should they dissent and try to follow their consciences.
19. I truly believe that everyone has the God-given facility of a Conscience that tells him or her what is right and what is wrong. Immanuel Kant called the Conscience the “Categorical Imperative”.
20. I truly believe that the Banks are thieves and, as the Bible says, “thieves only come to steal and kill and destroy” (John 10: 10).
21. I have been fight the Banks’ thievery of variable interest contract fraud in Australian Courts since 1996 – only to have Australian Judges conceal and protect this STEALING.
22. “Thou shalt not steal.” is the 8th Commandment.
23. Australian Judges and Magistrates willing play their part in the N.W.O. and use the Sheriffs and Police FORCE to carry out their UNLAWFUL JUDGMENTS that violate the CHARTERS OF LIBERTY.
24. I truly believe that there are members of the Judiciary who would rather “do right” but are too scared to step out of line.

25. However, and unfortunately, I fear there are many bureaucrats who choose to do wrong, for whatever insane reason that motivates them.
26. Steven Jupp is a bureaucrat and an Officer of the Supreme Court of the State of New South Wales. He has assumed that he has the power to make a judgment that impacts on Freeman. He, nor does any servant of the People, have any authority over Freeman and, when these persons usurp the sovereignty of the People by taking away access to the “lawful judgment of a jury”, that is nothing less than treason... the same treason that Christopher John Armitage is guilty of.
27. On Tuesday the 7th day of December 2010, I received in the post a letter from the Supreme Court of New South Wales that contained the Summons and two Affidavits that I left with the Duty Registrar at Queen’s Square, the previous Thursday. Also, in the envelop was a covering letter, with an illegible signature “For the Principal Registrar”, that said “A registrar of the court has determined that there is n o proper cause for action in this matter” and “The application has been considered by the Court and has been refused”.
28. I truly believe it is an act of treason that any registrar makes any determination on a Summons that a Freeman presents to a Court because I truly believe that “TRIAL BY JURY IS DEMOCRACY”, which are the words on a T-shirt I frequently wear when attending a Court. I have another T-shirt with the words, “GOD AND MY RIGHT”, which I wear to Court on other occasions.
29. I truly believe no one is above the law.
30. I truly believe that when Judges proclaim the existence of a “Doctrine of Immunity” for themselves, they desperately hope that no one knows of the Habeas Corpus Act of 1641 that Abolished the Star Chamber and imposes severe punishment on any Judge who violates the People’s Rights guaranteed “for ever” by Magna Carta.
31. Annexed hereto and marked “A” is a copy of the Habeas Corpus Act of 1641 - An Act to Abolish the Star Chamber.

32. Annexed hereto and marked "A" is a copy of the Habeas Corpus Act of 1641 - An Act to Abolish the Star Chamber.
33. Trial by Jury is our Constitutional, inalienable and inherited right. It is our safeguard of freedom. It is **THE TRIAL OF A FREEMAN-ON-THE-LAND BY LAW, RIGHT AND OATH BY TWELVE OF HIS EQUALS**. It is the voice and conscience of the people to defeat injustice, corruption and treachery. In any action, a Jury must demand the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so that they are able to judge both law and fact. Whether a juror swears an oath or makes an affirmation, the primary consideration should be what binds the conscience of the individual.
34. "And one of them, a lawyer, trying him questioned: Teacher, which is *the* great commandment in the law? And he said to him, Thou shalt love *the* Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second like *it is* this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hangeth the whole law and the prophets." (Matthew 22: 35 – 40)
35. MAGNA CARTA 1215, CAP XXXIX: "No freeman shall be taken indeed imprisoned, either dispossessed, or outlawed, or exiled, or in any manner destroyed, nor pass over him, nor send over him, except by means of the legal judgment of his own equals indeed the law of the land. To no one will we sell, to no one will we deny or delay, Right or Justice."
36. CONFIRMATION OF THE CHARTERS, 1297 says: "...that the Great Charters of Liberties and the Charter of the Forest, which were made by common assent of all the realm, in the time of King Henry our father, shall be kept in every point without breach....we have granted that they shall be observed in all points, and that our justices, sheriffs, mayors, and other officials which under us have to administer the laws of our land, shall allow the said charters in pleas before them and in judgments in all their points....And we will that if any judgment be given from henceforth, contrary to the points of the charters aforesaid, by the justices or by any other ministers that hold plea before them against the points of the charters, it shall be undone and holden for naught."

37. The PETITION OF RIGHT, 1627 says: in section 3. “And where also by the statute called, The Great Charter of the Liberties of England, it is declared and enacted, That no freeman may be taken or imprisoned, or be disseised of his freehold or liberties or his free customs, or to be outlawed or exiled, or in manner destroyed, but by the lawful judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land.” and in section 8. “That the awards, doings and proceedings, to the prejudice of your people in any of the premises, shall not be drawn hereafter into consequence or example.”
38. The SUPREME COURT PROCEDURE ACT No. 49, 1900 says under section 3. “(1) In any action by consent of both parties the whole or any one or more of the issues of fact in question may be tried, or the amount of any damages or compensation may be assessed by a Judge without a jury.”.
39. The COMMON LAW PROCEDURE ACT No: 21, 1899 are relevant the conduct of proceedings in this or any matter before the Supreme Court of New South Wales: “s.256. Upon the hearing of any motion or summons, the Court or Judge may, upon such terms as the Court or Judge thinks reasonable, order any document to be produced, and any witness to appear and be examined viva voce, either before the Court or a Judge or before a commissioner for affidavits; and upon hearing such evidence or reading the deposition may make such rule or order as may be just”. and “s.257. (1) The Court or Judge may by such rule or order, or by any subsequent rule or order, command the attendance of the witnesses named therein for the purpose of being examined or the production of any document mentioned therein”. And “s.259. The Court or judge may amend any notice of motion, rule nisi, writ, pleading, affidavit, jurat or title of affidavit, record, praecipe, or other proceeding used before the Court or Judge not likely to mislead the opposite party on any point essential to the merits of the case, and may award such reasonable costs of such amendment as to the Court or Judge seem fit.”
40. The INTERPRETATION ACT No. 15, 1987 says under section 30. “(1) The amendment or repeal of an Act or statutory rule does not: ... (c) affect any right, privilege, obligation or liability acquired, accrued or incurred under the Act or statutory rule.”.

41. Every person is entitled to NATURAL JUSTICE which is described as the “Rules of fair play, originally developed by the court of equity to control the decisions of inferior courts and then gradually extended (particularly in the 20th century) to apply equally to the decisions of administrative and domestic tribunals and any authority exercising an administrative power that affects a person’s status, rights and liabilities. Any decision reached in contravention of natural justice is void as ultra vires. There are two principal rules: (1) The first is the rule against bias (ie: against departure from the standard of even-handed justice required of those who occupy judicial office) - nemo iudex in causa sua (or in propria causa). This means that any decision, however fair it may seem, is invalid if made by a person with any financial or other interest in the outcome or any known bias that might have affected his impartiality. The second rule is known as audi alteram partem (hear the other side). It states that a decision cannot stand unless the person directly affected by it was given a fair opportunity both to state his case and to know and answer the other side’s case.” (Oxford Reference A Dictionary of Law, Oxford University Press, Third Edition).

42. HALSBURY’S LAWS OF AUSTRALIA says under (130-13460): “Consent to summary jurisdiction The consent to be tried summarily must be clear and unequivocal and a failure to carry out the procedures for obtaining the consent will deprive the court of jurisdiction to determine the matters summarily.” Thomas Jefferson said in 1821: “The germ of destruction of our nation is in the power of the judiciary, an irresponsible body - working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall render powerless the checks of one branch over the other and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated.”.

43. DUE PROCESS is a course of legal proceedings according to rules and principles that have been established in a system for jurisprudence for the enforcement and protection of private rights. Due Process derives from early English Common Law. The first concrete expression of the Due Process idea embraced by Anglo-American law appeared in the 39th Article of Magna Carta 1215. (*Encyc. Brit.*).

44. The Right to Trial by Jury is an inalienable Right of all Freemen (Part 1 – Constitutional Enactments listed in the NSW Imperial Acts Application Act 1969 No. 30, Second Schedule).
45. It is the RULE OF LAW that is (1.) The supremacy of law. and (2) a feature attributed to the UK constitution by Professor Dicey (*Law of the Constitution*, 1885). It embodied three concepts: the absolute predominance of regular law, so that the government has no arbitrary authority over the citizen; the equal subjection of all (including officials) to the ordinary law administered by the ordinary courts; and the fact that the citizen's personal freedoms are formulated and protected by the ordinary law rather than by abstract constitutional declarations.(Oxford Reference, A Dictionary of Law, Oxford University Press)
46. I am a Freeman, the equal of any other Freeman, and have the Right to the lawful Judgment of a congregation of twelve other Freemen gathered together as a Jury, with each Juror asking “So help me God”, in order that they can administer Justice.
47. A Legal Maxim says, “Rights never die”.
48. I am of the People and Australia is a Democracy, which translates from the Greek to “People Rule”. We the People exercise our Sovereignty, ie: our ultimate authority to make and impose laws, through the unanimous Judgments from Trials by Juries. These Judgments are the Common Law. “Common law doth control Acts of Parliament and adjudge them when against common right to be void” (Lord Edward Coke). No Act of Parliament can take away my Right to Trial by Jury.
21. Thomas Jefferson said in 1821: “The germ of destruction of our nation is in the power of the judiciary, an irresponsible body – working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall render powerless the checks of one branch over the other and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated.”.
22. No Statutory Laws no Rules nor Regulations, can take away my Right to Trial by Jury.
23. Lord Edward Coke once said, “Common law doth control Acts of

Parliament and adjudges them when against common right to be void.”.

24. Common Law is the Law of the People, by the People and for the People.
25. Acts of Parliament (ie: mere Statute Law) endeavouring to take away the Right to trial by Jury are *ultra vires*.
26. People are not subject to Statute Law, which is inferior to Common Law, and are only accountable to Common Law that is made and imposed by their equals, ie: accountable only to Juries.
27. Judges have sworn to “well and truly serve” the Crown, as has the Sheriff of New South Wales. The Defendant to this action claims he is a Judge of the Supreme Court of New South Wales.
28. It is the duty of a Sheriff “to ensure that people can exercise their rights in court in safety”. Sheriffs who enforce the denial of the Right to Trial by Jury are as culpable as the Judge or Magistrate committing that treasonous offence.
29. “A man who exercises his rights harms no one”...a Legal Maxim.
30. “Trial by Jury is the Palladium of Liberty” (anon).
31. The denial of my Right to Trial by Jury is sinister, vile and reprehensible.
32. All Acts of Parliament in Australia since 1919, with the signing of the Treaty of Versailles, have not been lawfully enacted due to the fact that there have been no Orders in the Privy Council, ie: the Queen-in-Council, for the Appointments of any Vice Regal executive representatives of the Crown of the United Kingdom to grant the “Royal Assent” to enact Statute Laws, which was the procedure when the Commonwealth of Australia was “under the Crown of the United Kingdom” as per the Act of the UK Parliament to Constitute the Commonwealth of Australia (Victoria 63 & 64, Chapter 12, 9th July 1900). It follows that all the Appointments of Judges and Magistrates are also fraudulent. Even if Christopher John Armitage were a legitimately appointed Judge, there is a Legal Maxim is still to be applied, and that is: “A Judge without jurisdiction is to be disobeyed with impunity”.

33. Australia is a Democracy which literally means that the PEOPLE RULE, ie: Sovereignty lies with the People who exercise that “ultimate authority to make and impose laws” by way of the unanimous Judgments of 12 Free Men empanelled as Jurors who ask, :”So help me God”, in order that they can administer Justice.

SWORN by the deponent at:

Before me:

.....
Signature of Deponent