



✉ scott.flannigan@  
andersonstrathern.co.uk

Scott Flannigan,

**Your client: Scottish Children's Reporter Administration corporation**

Your email of the 6<sup>th</sup> July 2018 is recorded.

As you are already aware, from formal common law court documentation and from the common law court Website, the common law court is the people.

The common law court is not a registered corporation or a person and stands under common law for all time.

Any flesh & blood man or woman choosing to use the common law court can do so, providing that they follow the basic principles of natural and common law. Thus, the common law court exists perpetually in cyberspace for all time, by the people, for the people and exists entirely in cyberspace. The common law court is used by the people to obtain a lawful remedy, committed by those who act dishonourably by hiding behind the legal fiction and who use a legal system to oppress the people for financial enrichment and to protect vested interests, which is abhorrent in a fair society.

As you know, the common law court holds individuals personally accountable for their own chosen conduct and each plaintiff agrees to be accountable to the common law court (The people) for the truthfulness of their statement of claim.

In this particular matter, the plaintiff cited a number of individuals to appear before the common law court, giving them adequate time to respond and to make personal submissions at a lawfully convened common law court hearing. The individuals concerned were to be questioned about the return of the plaintiffs' child (Property), notwithstanding that they were also provided with an opportunity to negotiate a settlement prior to the common law court hearing.

All of the individuals concerned chose not to respond, chose not to negotiate a settlement and chose not to appear to defend their conduct, despite being given the opportunity to do so. The jury of peers took these individual's choices as a tacit admission of guilt and then by

virtue of the authority of the people, unanimously found those individuals guilty. Having reached a guilty verdict, the jury then passed the appropriate sentence which not only protected the plaintiff and her child, they also protected the interests of the public and the community.

This unanimous decision by a lawfully convened court cannot be overturned.

Note that these individuals were also asked to prove that the child in question (Property) was not being put at risk and they could not do so.

Any attempt to threaten any flesh and blood man or woman using or participating with the common law court (The people) or to attempt to draw flesh and blood men and women into an inequitable legal process, may be a wilful crime against the people and such an individual would be capable of being held personally accountable for their actions.

Ignorance of common law is no excuse.

The common law court does not deal with corporations. You state that you re-present and advise the corporation.

This is a matter between those found guilty by the common law court and the plaintiff, by virtue of their own choice of conduct.

This common law court response is given in good faith and as a courtesy to you as an individual in an attempt to bring matters to a lawful, speedy resolution and therefore is not required to rebut each point you make. A reasonable gesture, considering the unequivocal facts.

The common law court and plaintiff can only discuss this matter with you as an individual, if you are prepared to be accountable for your own actions, if you can provide a personal mandate, from any of those found guilty, to act for them and as it is noted that you have worked on dispute resolution, a copy of their professional indemnity insurance cover would be a helpful first step.

The decision of the unanimous jury of peers stands and will be enforced by operation of law, unless and until each individual found guilty chooses to comply in full and or reach an agreement with the plaintiff on her terms, notwithstanding that those found guilty may choose to bring a statement of claim against you personally, before the common law court, if they feel you have mis-advised them, contributing to their further loss created by an unnecessary delay in settling.

Without prejudice,

The common law court