

Ozaukee county
The State of Wisconsin
The several united States of America

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGMENT

Claim #20LDPS-0131

[in re: Milwaukee County Circuit Court #93-CV-017906]

The united States of America, and
Steven Alan: Magritz, ex rel
Steven Alan, Public Minister
c/o W3797 Shady Lane
Saukville
Wisconsin

vs

United States
c/o United States Attorney General [Janet Reno], and
United States Secretary of State [Madeline Albright]
Washington, District of Columbia

and,

State of Wisconsin
c/o Attorney General of Wisconsin [James E. Doyle]
Madison, Wisconsin

and,

von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., as an organization and each stockholder
and each director and each officer individually as beneficiary officer(s) of
a beneficiary controlled artificial entity; and

Beth J. Kushner, individually;

STATEMENT OF FACT

- A. Respondents were served a PETITION FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCE in the nature of a PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL REMEDY DEMAND (Petition) and granted five (5) days to respond.
- B. Petitioners received no timely response to the "PETITION FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCE...", and Respondents were served a NOTICE OF FAULT, and granted a three day opportunity to cure the condition of fault.
- C. Petitioners have received no timely response to either the "PETITION FOR REDRESS..." or the NOTICE OF FAULT during the period for timely response.
- D. The verified Petition set forth certain facts, made inquiries, and provided proposed answers to the inquiries. Petitioners provided NOTICE to Respondents that any failure to answer would be accepted as assent to all claimed facts and answers to inquiries, *STARE DECISIS*, by *TACIT PROCURATION*.
- E. Petitioners provided Respondents NOTICE that Respondents may, if Respondents believe the complained of conduct may raise to the level of criminal activity, provide notice of the exercise of the respondents right or privilege to remain silent, along with proof of an investigation of possible criminal activity by respondents relating to the subject matter of Claim # 20LDPS-0131.
- F. Respondents have made no notice of such proof of submission to a grand jury, or prosecuting authority.
- G. As an operation of LAW Respondents are in DEFAULT, admit fault, and assent to all verified claims and answers to inquiry provided in Petitioner's Petition by *TACIT PROCURATION*. Said verified claims and answers to inquiry are *STARE DECISIS* and may not be controverted in any future administrative, civil, judicial, or commercial process.

ADMITTED FACTS

- I. *The administrative record shows that Respondents(s) have admitted, by TACIT PROCURATION, Stare Decisis:* On or about October 2, 1999 anno Domini (AD) a person who identified himself as Tom Wagner entered the private land subject to the proprietary control of Steven Alan: Magritz, a flesh and blood man foreign to the municipal corporation STATE OF WISCONSIN.
- II. *The administrative record shows that Respondents(s) have admitted, by TACIT PROCURATION, Stare Decisis:* While upon Steven Alan: Magritz private land Tom Wagner placed upon the private car of Steven Alan: Magritz some folded papers and stated "you've been served". Upon inspection of the papers, Steven Alan: Magritz read the words "SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM" and saw the blue ink hand signature of Beth J. Kushner, State Bar No. 1008591. The papers were "Accepted For Value" and added to the secured property of Steven Alan: Magritz on Notice at Wisconsin Department of Financial Institutions, Record #01881263.
- III. *The administrative record shows that Respondents(s) have admitted, by TACIT PROCURATION*

=====

Stare Decisis: On or about January 5, 2000 anno Domini (AD) Steven Alan: Magritz was presented a copy of a letter dated December 2, 1999, signed by Beth J. Kushner and addressed to Francis T. Wasielewski. The author of the letter engaged in "labeling" and slanderous attacks on Steven Magritz. Beth J. Kushner was granted a written opportunity to disavow the contents of the letter and /or the signature of Beth J. Kushner. **Beth J. Kushner responded under her personal hand signature but did not disavow the contents of the letter** nor the fact that Beth J. Kushner signed the letter.

- IV. **The administrative record shows that Respondents(s) have admitted, by TACIT PROCURATION, Stare Decisis:** Based upon the names on the letterhead of the December 2, 1999 letter from Beth J. Kushner to Francis T. Wasielewski and subsequent investigation **Beth J. Kushner is an employee of the enterprise von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., doing business as (d/b/a) an attorney, in a co-business relationship with, or in privity with,** numerous other persons d/b/a attorneys, including but not limited to Catherine Doyle, Karl Rohlich, Ralph von Briesen, Dennis J. Purtell, Wayne J. Roper, Lynn Sondreal, Tom Streifender, Bill Taibl, Bill West, John Yentz, David Snow, **James E. Doyle,** and Janet Reno.
- V. **The administrative record shows that Respondents(s) have admitted, by TACIT PROCURATION, Stare Decisis:** Beth J. Kushner stated in the December 2, 1999 letter to Francis T. Wasielewski that Steven Magritz ". . . took a course in how to file the sort of **bogus liens . . .**" (emphasis added). **Beth J. Kushner also stated "Further, Mr. Magritz is specifically alleged in the Fourth Amended Complaint to have engaged in predicate acts of racketeering."**
- VI. **The administrative record shows that Respondents(s) have admitted, by TACIT PROCURATION, Stare Decisis:** On or about January 5, 2000 A.D., Steven A. Magritz wrote to Beth J. Kushner and requested a copy of the "Fourth Amended Complaint" as referenced in the Kushner letter of December 2, 1999. Beth J. Kushner refused to provide a copy as requested.
- VII. **The administrative record shows that Respondents(s) have admitted, by TACIT PROCURATION, Stare Decisis:** **In order to investigate what appeared to be a concerted effort to slander the credit of Steven A. Magritz, the Secured Party (Steven Alan: Magritz) obtained a copy of the document titled "FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT" [Case No. 93-CV-017906] dated the 15th day of December, 1998 and signed by Beth J. Kushner, State Bar No. 1008591.**
- VIII. **The administrative record shows that Respondents(s) have admitted, by TACIT PROCURATION, Stare Decisis:** The following answers to inquiries are based upon the contents of the documents aforementioned and upon the acts and actions of the members of the aforementioned enterprise.

ADMITTED ANSWERS TO INQUIRIES

The following items numbered **1 through 21** relate to documentation requested by Petitioner that **Respondents failed or refused to provide.** Items **22 through 107** are admitted answers to inquiries.

1. A certified copy of each individual respondent's oath of office as required by law.
2. A certified copy of each individual respondent's oath to each and every bar association.

43. Do members of the State Bar of Wisconsin hold the position of prosecutor, judge, and defense advocate in virtually every action in Wisconsin courts?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

44. Do the members of the State Bar of Wisconsin privately profit, the administrative enterprise profit, and the state profit from this process of depriving the People of life, liberty, and property, without any adversarial hearing?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

45. Are members of the State Bar of Wisconsin resident beneficiaries and fiduciaries of the agency known as Milwaukee County Circuit Court?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

46. Are Plaintiffs in Milwaukee County Circuit Court Case #93-CV-017906 members of the State Bar of Wisconsin?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

47. Are Plaintiffs in Milwaukee County Circuit Court Case #93-CV-017906 in privity with or in a co-business relationship with the enterprise known as von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

48. Are von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., in privity with or in a co-business relationship with the occupant of the office of State of Wisconsin Attorney General?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

49. Is Plaintiff Catherine Doyle in Milwaukee County Circuit Court Case #93-CV-017906 the sister of State of Wisconsin Attorney General James E. Doyle?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

50. Is "BAR" as in State Bar of Wisconsin an acronym for British Accreditation Regency?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

=====

51. Are von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., in privity with or in a co-business relationship with the occupant of the office of United States Attorney General?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

52. Are von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., receiving money and /or other good and valuable consideration from State of Wisconsin and /or the Department of Justice of State of Wisconsin to prosecute Milwaukee County Circuit Court Case # 93-CV-017906 on behalf of Catherine Doyle?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

53. Are von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., receiving money and /or other good and valuable consideration from United States Department of Justice to prosecute Milwaukee County Circuit Court Case # 93-CV-017906 on behalf of Catherine Doyle?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

54. Are the receipt of monies and /or other good and valuable consideration by von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., from United States Department of Justice to prosecute Milwaukee County Circuit Court Case #93-CV-017906 on behalf of Catherine Doyle considered an act of theft in office?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

55. Are the receipt of monies and /or other good and valuable consideration by von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., from State of Wisconsin or State of Wisconsin Department of Justice to prosecute Milwaukee County Circuit Court Case #93-CV-017906 on behalf of Catherine Doyle considered an act of theft in office?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

56. Has VCY America, Inc., and Vic Eliason, officer, director and /or employee of VCY America, Inc., exercised freedom of speech and exposed criminal acts and treasonous acts by officers, employees and /or agents of United States?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

57. Has VCY America, Inc., and Vic Eliason exercised freedom of speech and exposed criminal acts and treasonous acts by officers, employees and /or agents of State of Wisconsin?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

=====

58. Have officers, employees and /or agents of United States and State of Wisconsin acted in concert to silence and injure VCY America, Inc., and Vic Eliason, in retaliation for having the criminal acts and treasonous acts of said officers, employees and /or agents exposed?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

59. Have officers, employees and /or agents of United States and State of Wisconsin acted in concert to silence and injure VCY America, Inc., and Vic Eliason, in retaliation for having exposed the ritualistic blood sacrifice of shedding innocent blood required as part and parcel of religious "worship" and practiced in ancient times in the act known as causing a son or daughter "to pass through the fire to Molech"?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

60. In order to injure and silence VCY America, Inc., and Vic Eliason, have Respondents and /or officers, employees and /or agents of Respondents, acted in concert to fabricate a non-existent "conspiracy" between VCY America, Inc., and/or Vic Eliason, and Declarant or secured property of Declarant?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

61. In order to injure and silence VCY America, Inc., and Vic Eliason, have Respondents and /or officers, employees and /or agents of Respondents ("Respondents, et al"), acted in concert and made false statements regarding Declarant or secured property of Declarant?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

62. In order to injure and silence VCY America, Inc., and Vic Eliason, have Respondents and /or officers, employees and /or agents of Respondents ("Respondents, et al"), acted in concert and made slanderous statements against Declarant or secured property of Declarant?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

63. Were the aforesaid false accusations against Declarant or secured property of Declarant by Respondents, et al made with intent to injure Declarant?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

64. Were the aforesaid false accusations against Declarant or secured property of Declarant by Respondents et al made with the knowledge that they would injure Declarant?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

65. Were the aforesaid slanderous statements against Declarant or secured property of Declarant by Respondents et al made with intent to injure Declarant?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

66. Were the aforesaid slanderous statements against Declarant or secured property of Declarant by Respondents et al made with the knowledge that they would injure Declarant?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

67. Did Respondents et al take lawful acts of Declarant exercising the imprescriptable right to Petition For Redress of Grievance, and attempt to convert said lawful acts into "criminal" acts by malicious, false and /or slanderous statements, including but not limited to, insinuations regarding the impropriety, illegality, or unlawful use of Redress procedure known as Notice and Demand??

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

68. In the "FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT", did Beth J. Kushner set forth numerous statements against Declarant or secured property of Declarant which Beth J. Kushner knew were false, reckless, slanderous, or libelous?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

69. In the "FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT" did Beth J. Kushner set forth numerous false and /or slanderous statements against Declarant or secured property of Declarant which Beth J. Kushner had a duty or obligation to determine whether said statements were false, reckless, slanderous or libelous before making said statements?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

70. In the "FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT" did Beth J. Kushner set forth false and slanderous statements against Declarant or secured property of Declarant with the knowledge that said statements would cause an injury to Declarant?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

71. In the "FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT" did Beth J. Kushner set forth false and slanderous statements against Declarant or secured property of Declarant with the intent to cause injury to the credit of Steven A. Magritz [stramineus homo]?

=====

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

72. In the "FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT" did Beth J. Kushner set forth false and slanderous statements with knowledge that said statements would cause injury to the credit of Steven A. Magritz?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

73. Were the false and slanderous statements set forth by Beth J. Kushner in the "FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT" made with other persons of the aforementioned enterprise who did combine, agree, mutually undertake, or concert together for the purpose of willful or malicious injury to Steven A. Magritz in his reputation, trade, business or profession, or for the purpose of maliciously compelling Steven A. Magritz to perform an act against his will, or preventing or hindering Steven A. Magritz from doing or performing lawful acts?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

74. In June of 1994, prior to Declarant ever having heard the names "Catherine Doyle" or "David Kanz", Declarant received a personal telephone call from a long-time friend, Gary Kaeding, which Beth J. Kushner labels as a wrongful act. Is Beth J. Kushner, in a reckless, malicious, vicious manner, in concert with Respondents, et al, with will of intent and foreknowledge, attempting to cause an injury to Declarant or secured property of Declarant by setting forth false and slanderous statements?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

75. In the "FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT" Beth J. Kushner stated, several times, that Steven Magritz filed "false" financing statements, yet not one government agency has stepped forward and declared such filings are unlawful, illegal or criminal. Is Beth J. Kushner, in a reckless, malicious, vicious manner, in concert with Respondents, et al, with will of intent and foreknowledge, attempting to cause an injury to Declarant or secured property of Declarant by setting forth false and slanderous statements?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

76. In the "FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT" Beth J. Kushner falsely and slanderously stated, numerous times, that Steven Magritz acted with others, or intended to act with others, to do wrongful, unlawful, illegal, or criminal acts against a person named Catherine Doyle, whom Steven Magritz never met, does not know, would not recognize, and could care less about, except that she repent. Is Beth J. Kushner, in a reckless, malicious, vicious manner, in concert with Respondents, et al, with will of intent and foreknowledge, engaged in an attempt to cause an injury to Declarant or secured property of Declarant by setting forth false and slanderous statements?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

- 77. Are any of the statements made by Beth J. Kushner against Steven Magritz in the "FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT" which set forth [accuse of] wrongful , unlawful, illegal, or criminal, acts or intentions, true?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "NO".

- 78. Are all of the statements uttered by Beth J. Kushner against Steven Magritz in the "FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT" which set forth wrongful , unlawful, illegal, or criminal acts or intentions, false and slanderous, and uttered by Beth J. Kushner in a reckless, malicious, vicious manner, in concert with Respondents, et al, with will of intent and foreknowledge, in an attempt to cause an injury to Declarant or secured property of Declarant?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

- 79. Is a Notice and Demand a form of Petition For Redress of Grievance, giving a person who has made a mistake an opportunity to correct his error, and by said Notice and Demand such person may have sufficient notice to assert proper diligence and inquire further so as to discover that which an inquiry pursued in good faith would disclose?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

- 80. Are the statements made by Beth J. Kushner, d/b/a attorney and knowledgeable in the law, in the "FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT", against Steven Magritz with regard to Notice and Demand, made with reckless disregard of the truth, and set forth by Beth J. Kushner in a reckless, malicious, vicious manner, in concert with Respondents, et al, with will of intent and foreknowledge, in an attempt to cause an injury to Declarant or secured property of Declarant?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

- 81. Several times Beth J. Kushner, d/b/a attorney and knowledgeable in the law, describes a lien as a "bogus" lien. Is there any legal definition of the word "bogus"?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "NO".

- 82. Is the use of the word "bogus", as in bogus lien, as used by Beth J. Kushner, dolus and /or an intentional perversion of the truth, and set forth by Beth J. Kushner in a reckless, malicious, vicious manner, in concert with Respondents, et al, with will of intent and foreknowledge, in an attempt to cause an injury to Declarant or secured property of Declarant?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

83. Does Respondent admit that the "bogus" liens referenced by Beth J. Kushner are valid liens?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

84. Does Respondent admit that there are no facts in evidence of any criminal acts committed in the past, or presently occurring, by Declarant?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

85. Does Respondent admit that there is no VALID REASON to believe Declarant is involved in a crime or is in possession of property involved in a crime?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

86. Does Respondent admit that there is no GOOD REASON to believe Declarant is involved in a crime or is in possession of property involved in a crime?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

87. Does Respondent admit that, prior to 1938, all U.S. Supreme Court Decisions were based upon what is termed : "Public Law" or that system of law that was controlled by Constitutional limitation. After 1938, all U.S. Supreme Court Decisions are based on "Public Policy" concerning commercial transactions made under the "Negotiable Instrument Law," as a result of the U.S. Bankruptcy as declared by President Roosevelt on March 9, 1933 and codified at 12 U.S.C.A. 95a and by Executive Orders. This bankruptcy caused the change from "Public Law" to "Private Commercial Law" and was recognized by the Supreme Court in Erie v. Tompkins, (1938). After that case, all the procedures of Law were officially blended with procedures of Equity.

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

88. Does Respondent admit that, the Negotiable Instruments Law is a branch of the "International Law Merchant," which is now known as the "Uniform Commercial Code," (UCC) that was 'drafted' and made uniform, and "adopted in whole or substantially by all states." Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition - page 1531. Thus the several states were and are bound into commercial agreements to the federal United States under the Uniform Commercial Code.

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

89. Does Respondent admit that, the several (now 50) States accepted the "benefits" of federal grants

=====

offered by the Federal United States as the "consideration" of a commercial agreement between themselves. Under the agreement the States (Conference of Governors, March 6, 1933) pledged their full faith and credit and agreed to obey the dictates of Congress, and assume their portion of the National Debt, collected as "your fair share," as an example, in the nature of the unlawful *income tax*, wherein the IRS operates and collects such 'taxes' under the same UCC.

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

90. Does Respondent admit that, this system of Negotiable paper has bound all corporate entities (cities, municipalities, counties, etc.) of government together to the process /system of the Commercial Venue of Commercial Law as expressed and exercised within the Commercial Lien Process. This nation-wide Commercial "bond" also altered the original (law) status of the Courts to nothing more than "administrative tribunals" merely administering the bankruptcy (private policy) of debt collection for the Creditors.

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

91. Does Respondent admit that, by and through the bankruptcy, the UCC, and other acts, Congress in failing to uphold its constitutional duty to provide a lawful medium of exchange (i.e., "money" backed by silver and gold, or minted coin pursuant to Article 1, section 8, clause 5) have by these various "Acts" created an abundance of this *new* type of money called *commercial credit money* to circulate within the *Legislative democracy* called the United States...of which "they" are not bound by Constitutional law and limitation.

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

92. Does Respondent admit that, the Commercial Law Venue, compelled upon the people a forced "benefit" of "*limited liability for the payment of debt*" by the "use" of federal reserve notes (debt instruments) wherein "YOUR" debts are only discharged, (not paid) in the form of interest bearing negotiable instruments (federal reserve notes). "There is a distinction between a debt discharged and one paid. When discharged the debt still exists, though divested of its character as a legal obligation..." Stanek v. White, 215 NWR 781 (1927). Federal reserve notes are only evidence of debt owed to the Federal Reserve Bank and Federal Reserve Notes are a commercial lien on the Federal Reserve Bank.

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

93. Does Respondent admit that, since 1933, by the acts of the Bankruptcy and the UCC, the Law has been tainted, or "colored," (i.e., color of law) as it were, because the *commercial law* is operated in conjunction with the Negotiable Instruments Law, wherein the Federal Government by and through the Bankers, can /have declared that a 'piece of paper' has and represents value. Albeit that there is no substance (gold or silver) backing the 'piece of paper,' which the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago in it's publication "Modern Money Mechanics," page 3, has in fact declared the use of these debt instruments (federal reserve notes) a "confidence" game. The *substance* of the Law (*property*) (i.e., gold, silver, etc.) has been removed, like the substance that is the basis of money, accordingly, LAW

like MONEY becomes a fiction, make-believe! Therefore, in the U.S.A., by and through the UCC, all contracts, agreements, (implied, or otherwise, etc.), applications, permits, etc. where the "colorable" consideration (federal reserve notes) was passed in those 'contracts,' etc., all such contracts are then also "colored" and are not genuine, for no lawful consideration (gold or silver) was paid by either party to the contract to, by Law, pass both the "possession and the property" to the lawful Buyer. See - Bouvier's Dict. Of Law, 1839, "TITLE," definition #5. "The lawful coin of the United States will pass the property along with the possession."

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

94. Does Respondent admit that, today, all our "courts" (sic) sit as Non-Constitutional-Non-Article III Legislative Tribunals *administering* the bankruptcy through "their" *statutes* which are in reality "commercial obligations" for the BENEFIT OR PRIVILEGE OF DISCHARGING YOUR DEBTS WITH THE LIMITED LIABILITY OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE MONOPOLY "COLORABLE" MONEY NOTES!

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

95. Does Respondent admit that, under the current "colorable" legal system, the de-facto (we just do it) legislature has created "colorable" rights called *privileges*, imposes duties, lays down rules of conduct, and the legislative tribunals declare the same as "rights." These *privileges* are granted and given upon the peoples' voluntary act of asking "permission," then upon providing *any colorable* consideration (payment = discharge) the people then come under the *administrative jurisdiction* of Commercial Law.

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

96. Does Respondent admit that, today, in AMERICA, everyone, all governments included, are statutory law merchants dealing in negotiable paper (instruments) under the UCC for the limited liability for the *discharge* of debts, wherein a debt remains (fraud) and nothing else! The so-called "judges" are operating *only* a commercial tribunal to administer their "corporate" regulations concerning *all* financial transactions...both voluntary and those compelled.

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

97. Does Respondent admit that, ALL DEBTS are satisfied by one or both of two ways, a *payment*, or a *promise* to pay. Every *payment* is by *substance*, and every *promise* to pay is accomplished by a currency or paper which is technically known as *commercial lien*. The satisfaction of the debt by providing *substance* is called "*paying the debt.*" The satisfaction of the debt by a written or printed *promise* to pay the debt is called "*discharging the debt.*" All debts are "*paid*" by substance. All debts are only "*discharged*" by CURRENCY, POCKET MONEY NOTES, OR OTHER *COMMERCIAL LIENS* (Negotiable Instruments, i.e., Commercial Lien Security/Asset, i.e., UCC 1 Asset).

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

98. Does Respondent admit that, all paper money consists of NOTES which declare a debt or obligation and which promise or demand payment. All such evidences of debt or obligations are technically known as **COMMERCIAL LIENS**. Such 'notes' includes currency, for example, *federal reserve notes*, checks, drafts, conditional checks, notes of exchange (paper money /instruments between banks).

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

99. Does Respondent admit that, a Federal Reserve note is a commercial lien on the Federal Reserve Bank. A personal check is a commercial lien on the bank account of the maker of the check (cheque). A draft is a check (cheque) with a conditional agreement printed above the place of endorsement on the backside of the draft. A "note" of exchange is a commercial lien between the banks consisting of one bank demanding payment (discharge) from another bank. A personal check (cheque), while passing between banks, as a note of exchange, is a commercial lien.

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

100. Does Respondent admit that, bank accounts are backed (supported) either by substance money or by paper money, or by both. The substance money is called *collateral*. The paper money can be currency (for example, paper money notes), a loan of credit from the bank, or checks or other paper money as such, are commercial liens, received from other sources. Therefore the "property" declared /pledged or claimed to secure the obligation, and damages, *is the collateral* by and through the Commercial Lien process, which establishes (creates) the *credit* called commercial credit money.

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

101. Does Respondent admit that, valid "credit" currency (commercial lien) can be established by making a valid claim of debt (based on a damage or injury) by an affidavit in the form of a 'private security agreement' (and other related documents) and by allowing the lien to mature in three (3) months (90 days) into an accounts receivable (under commercial law) by the failure of the lien debtor to contest the 'agreement/lien' by answering or rebutting, by his affidavit, on a point for point basis.

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

102. Does the Respondent admit that, a lien must contain 1) the names of the party/parties, claimants, and debtors, 2) an affidavit stating the events which created the obligation, 3) a ledger giving a one-to-one correspondence between events and their values, 4) a list of property pledged or claimed to secure the payment (discharge) of the obligation, and 5) any evidence or exhibits in support of the claims made against the debtor.

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

103. Does the Respondent admit that, the primary method of establishing a COMMERCIAL LIEN currency/

=====

paper/negotiable instrument is to combine, 1) a promise to perform. 2) a claim of breach/damage/injury /fraud, etc., and 3) a three month (90 day) default to challenge or rebut the claim/lien on said point for point basis.

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

104. Does the Respondent admit that, Commercial Lien/value/currency can be in the form of a bank check (cheque), a draft, a UCC 1 Security, and its partial assignments... that pass, and are accepted, or circulate 'as' credit money.

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

105. Does the Respondent admit that, the "people," operating in their private capacity, by and through the remedy provided in the Uniform Commercial Code, pursuant to their collective sovereign capacity, upon injury or damage, may as a matter of right, proceed to utilize the Commercial Law venue against the agents of governments, their creations (corporations) and its officers (accountability = liability) to arrive at the truth and secure damages by the Commercial Lien process (to create & establish the damages in the form of UCC "money," i.e., a security, an asset, and liability) supported by the *full faith and credit of the United States Federal Government* under the Commercial Law and the UCC... America's Federal (and State) Common Law.

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

106. Does the Respondent admit to using "money" in "this state" that is not "...redeemable in lawful money of the United States, or current gold or silver coin ..."?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "YES".

107. Does Respondent claim any authority in Law upon which it may rely to determine that the acts claimed herein above do not meet the elements of an organized racket to corrupt the liberties which are guaranteed to the inhabitant(s) on the land at The State of Wisconsin by the original jurisdiction Constitution of the united States of America, AD 1789, as amended AD 1791?

United States, State of Wisconsin, Janet Reno, James E. Doyle, von Briesen, Purtell & Roper, s.c., and Beth J. Kushner have admitted the answer is: "NO".

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGMENT

Based upon the claims and admissions of the parties as appears in the administrative

=====

Record, Administrative Judgment evidencing the above fact(s) and Law is so entered.

Further Declarant says not.

[Redacted signature box]

2/28/2000
date

Administrative Hearings Officer

Prepared and submitted by:

The united States of America

Ozaukee county)
The State of Wisconsin) Verified Declaration

Steven Alan states that he is competent to be a witness and the facts related above are true, correct, and complete to the best of Steven Alan's first hand knowledge and belief under penalty of perjury pursuant to the Law of The State of Wisconsin.

By:




[Redacted signature box]

Steven Alan, Public Minister

February 28, 2000 A.P.
date

NOTARY CERTIFICATION

This page is certified by me, a Notary Public for the State of Wisconsin, to be an authentic copy of the original page with blue ink signatures affixed, on this third day of March, 2000 A.D.



John P. Ross
Notary Public

My Commission expires 5/4/03