



*Common Law Courts  
Great Britain & International*

**Court Orders for the  
International Common Law Court**

**Convened on the 20<sup>th</sup> January 2024**

**Cruinn House  
1 Wurzburg Court Dundee  
DD2 1 FB**

**Dated 26<sup>th</sup> January 2024**



# *Common Law Courts Great Britain & International*

**In the matter of**

**We the People (represented by John Smith), c/o Cruinn House, 1 Wurzburg Court, Dundee, DD2 1FB**

**(Plaintiffs)**

**V**

**Mark Edmondson (acting as Head of Business and Benefits, Ribble Valley Borough Council)**

**A Worden (acting as Legal Manager, East Lancashire/Blackburn Magistrates' Court)**

**Tracy Etienne (Justices' Clerk, Lancashire Magistrates Court)**

**Keith Townend (Head of Legal Operations Northwest Lancashire Magistrates Court)**

**Francois COULLET (URSSAF, Strasbourg, France)**

**Catherine TRIENBACH (President of Tribunal, Strasbourg, France)**

**Marco Buschmann (acting as the Federal Minister of Justice, Gottingen, Germany)**

**Stefan Studenroth (acting as the Senior Public Prosecutor, Gottingen, Germany)**

**Valentina Memmo (acting as a court official, Italy)**

**Giulia Bradanini (acting as a prosecutor, Italy)**

**Laura Mundell (acting as a Prosecutor Fiscal, Paisley Sheriff Court, Scotland)**

**Mungo Boverly (acting as a Sheriff, Paisley Sheriff Court, Scotland)**

**Mathers (acting as a Sheriff, Dundee Sheriff Court, Scotland)**

**Sineidin Corrins (acting as a Procurator Fiscal, Dundee, Scotland)**

**A Kemp (acting as an Employment Judge, Employment Tribunal, Dundee, Scotland)**

**Jay Lawson (acting as a solicitor, MML Law, Dundee, Scotland)**

**(Defendants)**



## *Common Law Courts Great Britain & International*

When commencing with the trial, the court Adjudicator introduced the named Plaintiff and confirmed the parties involved in this dispute.

Before proceeding, the named Plaintiff swore his oath to the court and then raised the following points which were discussed, accepted, and established as **facts in law**.

The named Plaintiff addressed the court and public gallery; he then thanked them for their assistance in this process.

The Plaintiff stated *“that in his opinion this case was probably the most important case that had come before the Common Law Court as it was addressing the largest crime that has been perpetrated against the people in history, and that this had been happening internationally for hundreds of years.”*

This court case was required to address the position of living men, living women and the issue of slavery.

The Plaintiff then explained that while he admired the existing statutory system, he confirmed that it was no longer fit for purpose as the system was run for profit, it did not provide a lawful remedy and that it was being run by criminals.

1. The named Plaintiff confirmed his standing within the Cruinn Community and under the Declaration of the Common Law Court. The Plaintiff also confirmed his positions as a CLC Diplomat and a CLC Commissioner for the CLC Peace Service.

The Lawful Charter for the Cruinn Community and the Declaration for the Common Law Court were read out as evidence to the public, these were shown as video presentations to the court.

The issue of standing within the Cruinn Community and under the Declaration of the Common Law Court was also applicable to all named Plaintiffs, in the cases referred to.

2. A Common Law Court Birth Certificate for John Smith had been obtained, confirming his standing as a living man, under the authority and jurisdiction of the Common Law Court.



## *Common Law Courts Great Britain & International*

This position was also applicable to all named Plaintiffs in the cases referred to.

3. A Common Law Court, Lawful Birth Declaration Certificate for John Smith had been obtained, confirming the date of his lawful creation.

This position was also applicable to all named Plaintiffs in the cases referred to.

4. A Business Ownership Certificate for the Fictitious Name (MR JOHN SMITH) had been obtained by John Smith (the living man), confirming not only his ownership of this legal entity but that it now fell under the authority and jurisdiction of the Common Law Court.

This position was also applicable to all named Plaintiffs in the cases referred to.

5. All evidence produced was discussed at length, this also included the evidence and response provided by the Defendants. Their confirmed positions were accepted as a fact in law and taken into consideration during the jury deliberation.


### **Dispute**

On behalf of We the People, represented by John Smith (a living man), he confirmed that the named Defendants had been charged with committing crimes against the people. These crimes included the use of fraud, the crime of uttering, obtaining money through deception, theft, unlawful detention, kidnapping and slavery, to name a few.

To assist with these crimes the Defendants were also guilty of using statutory authorities and legislation.

### **Alleged Wrong**

The Defendants, while committing crimes against the people, have caused them harm, loss, and injury. The Defendants have used the statutory authorities and



## *Common Law Courts Great Britain & International*

legislation to enforce their will on to the people, while ignoring their standing as living men and women.

No allowances or consideration were given before committing these crimes against the people and this behaviour is used internationally, and on a daily basis against the people.

In relation to the Plaintiffs case, John Smith then presented his Statement of Claim on behalf of the people.

The following points were addressed and accepted as facts in law. To assist this process, John Smith also referred eight different videos which he presented as evidence:

### **1. The Cruinn Community**

In 2022 a number of living men and women helped to create the Cruinn Community and its Lawful Charter. To record the establishment of this community, it was decided that from within those numbers, one hundred (100) living men and women would sign this Charter and that it would be recorded into the Common Law Court 'Book of Deeds', this was done on the 25<sup>th</sup> November 2022.

The Cruinn Community stands under the authority and jurisdiction of the Common Law Court and all members are either living men or women. Accordingly, Cruinn Community members stand for truth and freedom and will never be subject to any legal act, statute or statutory system.

### **2. The Common Law Court**

The initial Common Law Court was formed on 11<sup>th</sup> June 2017 to provide a lawful remedy for living men and women and to address the powers that seek to subvert our natural freedoms.

On the 3<sup>rd</sup> January 2019, the people created the Declaration of the Common Law Court with a sample of one hundred (100) signatures to establish its position. This Declaration was then recorded into the Common Law Court 'Book of Deeds.'



## *Common Law Courts Great Britain & International*

The Declaration of the Common Law Court also confirms that the living men and women, who submitted their birth declaration to the Common Law Court, stand under its authority and jurisdiction. Accordingly, this Declaration confirmed that as living men and women, they will no longer endure assaults on their loved ones and their personal freedoms, confirming their inherent right to stand under common law. Based, as it is, on timeless laws which govern the conduct of men and were established by their creator in days of old and remembered and loved by our fathers as they built our nations.

Borrowing from the declaration of their ancestors, made in Arbroath in 1320, the people declare that, as long as but a hundred of them remain alive, never will they be brought under mandatory rule by legal statute.

### **3. Authority**

Having confirmed their position and standing as living men and women through the Common Law Court Declaration, and as members of the Cruinn Community, the Plaintiffs stand under the authority of the Common Law Court. This position has been confirmed to this court hearing with confirmation of their declarations, made to the Common Law Court and Cruinn Community.

In relation to the Defendants referred to in this case, they have failed to provide any evidence or proof to confirm that they have authority over a living man or a living woman. In fact all statutory legislation that they are using to attack the people is only applicable to the legal entity 'PERSON.'

To further assist with this issue, the Plaintiff referred to an order that they previously issued on the 31<sup>st</sup> August 2019.

This court order confirmed that the Queen's Coronation in 1953 was not conducted lawfully as they did not have the Stone of Destiny in place.

On the second last page in this order, under point number five, it confirms that the authority that the state believe they have, is derived from the crown and as the court orders confirm that the crown does not exist, the statutory bodies have no authority over living men and women.



## *Common Law Courts Great Britain & International*

### **4. Jurisdiction**

Having confirmed their position and standing as living men and women through the Common Law Court Declaration and as members of the Cruinn Community, the Plaintiffs stand under the jurisdiction of the Common Law Court. This position has been confirmed at this court hearing with confirmation of their declarations, made to the Common Law Court and Cruinn Community.

In relation to the Defendants referred to in this case, they have failed to provide any evidence or proof to confirm that they have jurisdiction over a living man or a living woman. In fact, all statutory legislation that they are using to attack the people is only applicable to the legal entity 'PERSON.'

### **5. Contract**

The fact that the Defendants were attacking the people; they may only do so if they had authority, jurisdiction and a lawful contract. As their disputes involve more than one party, it becomes a contractual dispute for which they would need to comply with their own legal requirements, to ensure its legality.

According to the Defendants own contract laws they have failed to establish a valid contract, they have failed to produce evidence or proof of a valid contract and they have not obtained the signatures of all parties concerned, to establish a contract.

### **6. Slavery**

The subject of slavery has been addressed in many countries and it is deemed to be abhorrent at all levels. The Defendants have all bound the Plaintiffs into slavery through the use of the legal fiction, statutory law and their refusal to recognize and accept the position of living men and women.

When a man or woman appears in a statutory court to confirm their standing, they should be acknowledged as heroes and rewarded with medals, they should be recorded as heroes and our children should be told about them, but the courts used by the Defendants will not even acknowledge them as living and have prosecuted them as LEGAL PERSONS/LEGAL ENTITIES and NOT LIVING MEN AND WOMEN.



## *Common Law Courts Great Britain & International*

### **7. Company Numbers**

The Plaintiffs confirmed that the Defendants while attacking the Plaintiffs have been using their legal identities to do so, all of which are registered companies and recorded with Dun and Bradstreet. The Defendants have also failed to provide full disclosure which in any contractual dispute voids the contract.

The Defendants as commercial enterprises can ONLY operate with full disclosure, by mutual consent and with equal consideration, they have failed to do so and have intentionally committed fraud with menaces in order to make a financial gain.

### **8. Challenge to Authority and Jurisdiction**

To deal with attacks by the Defendants, the Plaintiffs have lodged a formal challenge to the authority and jurisdiction of the courts and statutory authorities.

These challenges have been refused and the Defendants proceed regardless, in doing so they have failed to establish authority, jurisdiction and a lawful contract to allow them to proceed.

In relation to this issue, if a Plaintiff confirms that they are living, this is ignored and they are bound into slavery by attaching the legal fiction to them.

If this position is not accepted the Defendants involved would either dismiss them from court or find them in contempt of court.

It should also be confirmed that by insisting that statutory conditions, paperwork, laws, rules and statutes are complied with, this binds the Plaintiff into slavery.

### **9. The Hague**

In 1951 The Hague Convention agreed with its members that when dealing with the issue of two separate judicial systems and the issue of a Conflict of Laws has to be addressed, a mutual agreement is then required to establish who hears the case.





## *Common Law Courts Great Britain & International*

This position was raised with the Defendants, but the issue has been ignored, in proceeding with a statutory court case they have failed to comply with the convention.

### **10. The United Nations**

Although referred to as statutory legislation, the countries that have signed up to the United Nations have all agreed to comply with the Universal Declaration on Human Rights (1948), in failing to comply with this legislation the countries concerned are committing crimes against the people.

It should be noted that the Defendants are guilty of failing to comply with the following Articles within this Declaration:

- **Article 4**

No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.

- **Article 7**

All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any incitement to such discrimination.

- **Article 10**

Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.

- **Article 12**

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

- **Article 18**

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, this



## *Common Law Courts Great Britain & International*

right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in a community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observance.

- **Article 19**

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

- **Article 20**

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.
2. No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

To highlight this unlawful behaviour and the crimes committed against the people, we have listed various crimes which have been committed against the people below. We also refer to cases in five different countries to show that this behaviour is international.

The following list, although not exhaustive outlines various crimes the Defendants have committed:

1. Failed to identify the parties in relation to any dispute.

*The refusal to confirm if the individuals are living, a PERSON or a CORPORATION.*

2. Failed to provide their proof of a claim.

*The Plaintiffs in this case have all confirmed their standing with proof, but the Defendants have failed to produce any proof to confirm their claim, standing or who they are.*

3. Failed to provide proof of their authority.

*The Defendants have failed to provide proof of their authority, despite the requirement to do so and have proceeded without establishing it.*

*There is no statutory legislation that deals with living men or women as they only deal with PERSONS OR CORPORATIONS.*



## Common Law Courts Great Britain & International

4. Refused to allow a challenge to their authority and jurisdiction.

*Each and every individual has the right to challenge both authority and jurisdiction, but the Defendants refuse to allow a challenge. In one of our highlighted cases, the Sheriff (Mungo Bovey) actually broke with procedure to confirm that he would allow a challenge after the prosecutor had presented their case, although this must be done before the case commences.*

*When the prosecutor had finished their presentation, the Sheriff refused to allow the challenge and when questioned on this point he admitted that he lied in a court of law and that he would not allow this.*

5. Refused to address the issue of a conflict of laws.

*Despite the requirement to deal with the issue of a Conflict of Laws when dealing with two separate judicial systems, the Defendants ignored the Hague Convention 1951 and proceed within their own system.*

6. Failed to confirm that they were registered corporations.

*The Defendants have all failed to confirm that they were registered corporations; these facts were challenged but ignored by the Defendants.*

7. Failed to confirm that their disputes were contractual.

*As these disputes involved more than one party, contract law confirms that this is a contractual dispute.*

*To establish a valid contract it requires agreement, acceptance and signatures from all parties concerned.*

8. Failed to produce a copy of the signed contract.

*The Defendants were asked to provide a copy of the signed contract for the disputes in question, and they failed to do so.*

9. Refused to accept the position of living men and women.

*The Defendants have all refused to accept the position of living men and women and*



## *Common Law Courts Great Britain & International*

*have confirmed their refusal to confirm their own standing.*

### 10. Failed to accept Common Law Court deeds.

*Common Law Court deeds are lawfully issued documents by the court. This court carries with it the authority of the people.*

*Despite having issued thousands of these deeds none has ever been challenged.*

*In relation to one of our cases referred to, the Defendants would not proceed with a Data Subject Access Request until they received proof of ID. This proof was provided by way of a Common Law Court Passpport and a Common Law Court ID card, both confirming the standing of a living man. This was accepted as proof of ID but the Defendant involved then proceeded to prosecute a living man.*

*There is no statutory legislation that allows them to do that.*

### 11. Refused to accept the standing of members within the Cruinn Community.

*Despite the Plaintiffs inherent birth rights, the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, which includes the freedom to change their religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in a community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.*


*The Defendants refuse to accept this and are binding them into slavery.*

### 12. Refused to accept the position and standing of a Common Law Court Diplomat.

*Similar to the above points, the Common Law Court previously issued a court order confirming the right to create CLC Diplomats positions for living men and women, these positions have been established but the statutory authorities will not engaged with them.*

*A CLC Embassy has also been established and recognized by the statutory system through the Royal Mail and correspondence with international governments, courts and statutory bodies.*

### 13. Failed to comply with Common Law Court Orders.



## *Common Law Courts Great Britain & International*

*Despite the acceptance that the Common Law Court convenes its own courts and issues its own court orders, the statutory system refuses to comply with them.*

*No reason has been given for this refusal, but the court orders issued were against living men and women who were using corporate positions to commit crimes against the people.*

14. Failed to comply with common law rights.

*The Defendants only deal with statutory legislation and persons or corporations.*

15. Failed to comply with statutory legislation.

*Although working within the statutory system, the Defendants refuse to comply with their own legislation and when doing so they are not held accountable.*

16. The intimidation and threats used against the people.

*To assist with intimidation, threats, and enforcement of statutory legislation the Defendants unlawfully use statutory bodies, bailiffs, military, police etc.*

17. The enforcement of unlawful statutory legislation against living men and women.


*The Defendants are guilty of using statutory courts, legislation, and bodies to enforce their will against living men and living women. They are not being held accountable for their actions and inaction.*

18. The use of Fraud internationally against the people.

*This case has highlighted the issue of fraud that is committed against living men and women, through the use of the fictitious name/legal entities.*

*This fraud used by the state was initiated at your birth and has continued throughout the rest of your life.*

*The fraud was created because the state did not inform you that they had created a legal entity which they then attached to you.*



## Common Law Courts Great Britain & International

19. The use of slavery, internationally.

*Through the use of the legal entity attached to you the Defendants are guilty of binding you into slavery through the use of the slave's name (legal entity) and your position within their society as a citizen.*

20. The refusal to accept the authority of the people.

*Despite the fact that authority lies with the people, the individuals controlling the statutory system refuse to accept this.*

*This fraud has been created to control the statutory system and in doing so the people, the system will also punish individuals for non-compliance.*

21. The failure of the Defendants to comply with their own legislation (e.g. the United Nations Universal Declaration on Human Rights 1948 etc).

This Common Law Court has confirmed that the Defendants do not comply with their own legislation unless it meets their needs.

Should the Defendants fail to comply with their own legislation they will not be held accountable, in fact to address these issues many of the guilty parties are rewarded and move on to another position.

### Issued Orders

In relation to the Statement of Claim and the supporting evidence presented this day by John Smith on behalf of the Plaintiffs, we the Jury, consisting of twelve reasonably minded men and women and having considered all the evidence presented at this hearing, issue the following orders:

1. **We, the jury, hereby issue a court order** to confirm that the Defendants are guilty of committing the above crimes against the people (numbered 1 to 21).
2. **A further order is issued** to confirm that all orders, fines, penalties, and warrants referred to in the above cases are now void and that all action in relation to these cases will be ceased.



## *Common Law Courts Great Britain & International*

3. **A further order is issued** to confirm that the statutory authorities involved, amend their paperwork accordingly to reflect the decision of the Common Law Court.

These authorities will have a period of fourteen (14) days to act on this, and to issue an appropriate notification of compliance, in writing, to the Common Law Court.

This period commences from the date of receipt of this court order.

4. **A further order has been issued** confirming the requirement to return all money and property that the Defendants have obtained unlawfully in relation to the above cases; this should be returned within a fourteen (14) day period. In the event that the Defendants no longer have the property concerned, they will be liable for financial damages to cover the value.

This period commences from the date of receipt of this court order.

5. **A further order is issued** to compensate the individuals referred to in the above cases and to deal with the Defendants concerned, see below for details:

- 1) **Mark Edmondson (acting as Head of Business and Benefits, Ribble Valley Borough Council)** has been found guilty of committing the above crimes, numbered 1 to 21 above, against the people.

Mark Edmondson has unlawfully targeted Darral Pinch & Laraine Thompson Pinch. Mark Edmondson is now required to pay Darral Pinch & Laraine Thompson Pinch £46,000 for the unlawful charges made against them. A further total of £34,000 for failing to dismiss the case after they were presented with paperwork from the CLC Embassy and an additional £34,000 for their refusal to allow a challenge to their authority and claim.

- 2) **A Worden (acting as Legal Manager, East Lancashire/Blackburn Magistrates' Court)** has been found guilty of committing the above crimes, numbered 1 to 21 above, against the people.

A Worden has aided and abetted Ribble Valley Borough Council to unlawfully target Darral Pinch & Laraine Thompson Pinch. A Worden is now required to pay Darral Pinch & Laraine Thompson Pinch £46,000 for aiding and abetting Ribble Valley Borough Council. A further total of £34,000 for failing to dismiss the case after they were presented with



## *Common Law Courts Great Britain & International*

paperwork from the CLC Embassy and an additional £34,000 for their refusal to allow a challenge to their authority and claim.

- 3) Tracy Etienne (Justices' Clerk, Lancashire Magistrates Court) has been found guilty of committing the above crimes, numbered 1 to 21 above, against the people.

Tracy Etienne has unlawfully targeted Bradley Schofield and is now required to pay Bradley Schofield £10,000 for the unlawful charges made against him. A total of £10,000 for failing to dismiss the case when John Smith made Tracy Etienne aware of his position and £10,000 for the refusal to allow a challenge to Tracy Etienne's authority and jurisdiction at a hearing. This also covers Tracy Etienne's refusal to deal with the issue of a conflict of laws.

- 4) Keith Townend (Head of Legal Operations Northwest Lancashire Magistrates Court) has been found guilty of committing the above crimes, numbered 1 to 21 above, against the people.

Keith Townend has unlawfully targeted Bradley Schofield and is now required to pay Bradley Schofield £10,000 for the unlawful charges made against him. A total of £10,000 for failing to dismiss the case when John Smith made Keith Townend aware of his position and £10,000 for your refusal to allow a challenge to Keith Townend's authority and jurisdiction at a hearing. This also covers Keith Townend's refusal to deal with the issue of a conflict of laws.

- 5) **Francois COULLET (URSSAF, Strasbourg, France)** has been found guilty of committing the above crimes, numbered 1 to 21 above, against the people. Francis COULLET has unlawfully targeted Christophe Wolff and is now required to pay Christophe Wolff £17,000 for the unlawful prosecution raised against him and a total of £17,000 for failing to dismiss the case after they were presented with the paperwork from the CLC Embassy.

- 6) **Catherine TRIENBACH (President of Tribunal, Strasbourg, France)** has been found guilty of committing the above crimes, numbered 1 to 21 above, against the people.





## *Common Law Courts Great Britain & International*

Catherine TRIENBACH has unlawfully targeted Christophe Wolff and is now required to pay Christophe Wolff £17,000 for the unlawful prosecution raised against him and a total of £17,000 for failing to dismiss the case after they were presented with the paperwork from the CLC Embassy.


- 7) Marco Buschmann (acting as the Federal Minister of Justice, Gottingen, Germany) has been found guilty of committing the above crimes, numbered 1 to 21 above, against the people and has unlawfully targeted Reiner Fuellmich. Marco Buschmann is now required to pay Reiner Fuellmich the sum of £99,000 for his kidnapping and unlawful detention and a further £25,000 for his psychological torture.
- 8) Stefan Studenroth (acting as the Senior Public Prosecutor, Gottingen, Germany) has been found guilty of committing the above crimes, numbered 1 to 21 above, against the people and has unlawfully targeted Reiner Fuellmich. Stefan Studenroth is now required to pay Reiner Fuellmich the sum of £99,000 for his kidnapping and unlawful detention and a further £25,000 for his psychological torture.
- 9) **Valentina Memmo (acting as a court official, Italy)** has been found guilty of committing the above crimes, numbered 1 to 21 above, against the people and has unlawfully targeted Michele Nasini.

Valentina Memmo is now required to pay Michele Nasini the sum of £26,000 for the unlawful prosecution raised against him and a total of £26,000 for failing to dismiss the case after she was presented with the paperwork from the CLC Embassy.

Valentina Memmo is also required to assist with the enforcement of and collection of the sum due for the perfected commercial lien and she is to be removed from office.

- 10) **Giulia Bradanini (acting as a prosecutor, Italy)** has been found guilty of committing the above crimes, numbered 1 to 21 above, against the people and has unlawfully targeted Michele Nasini.

Giulia Bradanini is now required to pay Michele Nasini the sum of £26,000 for the unlawful prosecution raised against him and a total of



## *Common Law Courts Great Britain & International*

£26,000 for failing to dismiss the case after she was presented with the paperwork from the CLC Embassy.

Giulia Bradanini is also required to assist with the enforcement of and collection of the sum due for the perfected commercial lien and she is to be removed from office.

- 11) Laura Mundell (acting as a Prosecutor Fiscal, Paisley Sheriff Court, Scotland) has been found guilty of committing the above crimes, numbered 1 to 21 above, against the people and has unlawfully targeted John Smith.

Laura Mundell is now required to pay John Smith the sum of £124,000 for the unlawful prosecution raised against him.

Laura Mundell also must be removed from office.

- 12) Mungo Bovey (acting as a Sheriff, Paisley Sheriff Court, Scotland) has been found guilty of committing the above crimes, numbered 1 to 21 above, against the people and has unlawfully targeted John Smith.

Mungo Bovey is now required to pay John Smith the sum of £124,000 for the unlawful prosecution raised against him and a total of £124,000 for failing to allow and hear his lawful challenge to the authority and jurisdiction of the court.

Mungo Bovey also must be removed from office.

- 13) **Mathers (acting as a Sheriff, Dundee Sheriff Court, Scotland)** has been found guilty of committing the above crimes, numbered 1 to 21 above, against the people and has unlawfully targeted John Smith.

Mathers is now required to pay John Smith the sum of £34,000 for the unlawful prosecution raised against him and a total of £34,000 for failing to allow and hear his lawful challenge to the authority and jurisdiction of the court.

Sheriff Mathers also must be removed from office.



## *Common Law Courts Great Britain & International*

- 14) Sineidin Corrins (acting as a Procurator Fiscal, Dundee, Scotland) has been found guilty of committing the above crimes, numbered 1 to 21 above, against the people and has unlawfully targeted John Smith.

Sineidin Corrins is now required to pay John Smith the sum of £34,000 for the unlawful prosecution raised against him.

Sineidin Corrins also must be removed from her office.

- 15) A Kemp (acting as an Employment Judge, Employment Tribunal, Dundee, Scotland) has been found guilty of committing the above crimes, numbered 1 to 21 above, against the people and has unlawfully targeted John Smith.

A Kemp is now required to pay the living woman Kendra Mann, the sum of £25,000 for the unlawful prosecution raised against her.

A Kemp is also required to pay the sum of £5,000 for failing to dismiss the case when presented with paperwork from John Smith, for failing to allow a challenge to the tribunal's authority and jurisdiction and for also failing to deal with the issue of a conflict of laws.

- 16) Jay Lawson (acting as a solicitor, MML Law, Dundee, Scotland) has been found guilty of committing the above crimes, numbered 1 to 21 above, against the people and has unlawfully targeted a living woman, Kendra Mann and a living man, John Smith.

Jay Lawson is required to pay the sum of £5,000 to the living woman Kendra Mann for the unlawful prosecution raised against her.

6. **A further order is issued** to confirm the following:
- I. That the German authorities are required to release Reiner Fuellmich immediately from the German prison, that he is currently being held in.
  - II. The German authorities are required to repatriate Reiner Fuellmich to the destination of his choice when released. The Defendants are also liable for any costs involved.
  - III. The Defendants are also required to issue new passports for both Reiner and Inka Fuellmich, if required.
  - IV. The Defendants are required to unfreeze all accounts and assets immediately,



## Common Law Courts Great Britain & International

- belonging to Reiner Fuellmich and Inka Fuellmich.
- V. The Defendants are to ensure the reinstatement of Reiner Fuellmich's position and statutory license for practicing law, should he require it.
  - VI. The named Defendants in relation to this issue are to be removed from office.
7. **A further order is issued** to confirm that if the United Nations does not assist with the enforcement of these courts' orders, then the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights (1948) should be torn up and the United Nations as a body should be terminated as they are not fit for purpose.


In the event that these orders are not complied with, the International Common Law Court may take further action against the individuals concerned, to enforce its decisions.

These Court Orders are effective as of this date and will remain in force until such time as they have been enforced. These orders are issued under the authority of this International Common Law Court and jus gentium, the Law of Nations.

IT IS SO ORDERED THIS 20<sup>th</sup> DAY OF JANUARY 2024, 5PM, GMT

Presiding Sheriff and the Court Secretary of the International Common Law Court.

  
(Signature of the Sheriff)

  
(Signature of the Court Secretary)

