



# CLC Embassy

John Smith (CLC Diplomat)  
CLC Embassy  
Cruinn House  
1 Wurzburg Court  
Dundee  
DD2 1FB

Date: 7<sup>th</sup> November 2023

Jay Lawson  
MML Law  
Meadowplace Buildings  
Bell Street  
DD1 1EJ

[jay@mmlaw.co.uk](mailto:jay@mmlaw.co.uk)

c.c

Court Clerk

[dundeet@Justice.gov.uk](mailto:dundeet@Justice.gov.uk)

Case number:

8000177/2023

ANTONIA OGILVIE V KENDRA MANN

## Lawful Notice & Required Clarification

Jay Lawson,

For context, you are considered informed that all meanings in this/all communication/s are taken from the Oxford Dictionary of English or as commonly understood by living men and women, they are not to be confused with legalese or any other language. All character layout, whether capitalised, lower case or a combination of both are what is commonly recognised by living men and women and not to be taken in any other way or meaning. My position in this communication is that of a living man, John Smith (Exhibit 1), owner of the PERSON (KENDRA MANN) that you refer to in this case (Exhibit 2), a CLC Diplomat (Exhibit 3) and Cruinn Community member (Exhibit 4), standing under gods law, also known as the creator's law, natural law, common law etc and operating outside the jurisdiction of statutory rules or man-made legislation. I do not work for any state department or the crown or operate under a licence as I do not require permission from another man or woman to run my life peacefully.

If you require the meaning or definition of any word, sentence, or paragraph in this document, then this can be done by submitting a written request within seven days, from receipt of this notice.

I, John Smith, a living man, a CLC Diplomat and Founding Elder of the Cruinn Community (a private members community) write to you for clarification, to address the issues raised in the case referred to above and those regarding the legal PERSON (KENDRA MANN).





## *CLC Embassy*

This issue is raising concerns, given your behaviour as a Claimant (Prosecutor), and your failure to contact me as the lawful owner of the PERSON that you are dealing with. As the owner of the PERSON that you refer to in this action, I confirm that I have not been made aware of any of the issues that you wish to raise.

As the Claimant (Prosecutor) in this action, it is your job to know who or what the Respondent is, as the burden of proof lies with you. Failure to identify the Respondent correctly would confirm that there is no case to answer.

In addition to the above point, it should also be noted that as you are required to meet the burden of proof, you, not the court are required to answer the following questions before you may proceed:

1. I write to confirm that you are unlawfully using personal property, the legal fiction/person 'KENDRA MANN' while trying to obtain money through deception.
2. In relation to this action, is the RESPONDANT a person?
3. Can you confirm what kind of person the RESPONDANT is for the benefit of the court.
4. You have used an unusual style convention to name the RESPONDANT in all capital letters.... Is the RESPONDANT's NAME written in Latin or something made to appear like Latin?
5. Are you aware that writing the RESPONDANT's name in capital letters has a meaning indicating that the RESPONDANT is either a dead woman's estate, a corporation, or a trademark?
6. Can you confirm that as a prosecutor you will record in the court record that your writing style, attributes meanings to the use of capital letters to name the RESPONDANT in this case (Case Number 8000177/2023).
7. In relation to this action, is the RESPONDANT a trademark?
8. In relation to this action, is the RESPONDANT dead?
9. In relation to this action, is the RESPONDANT a corporation?
10. If the RESPONDANT is a corporation, what kind of corporation is it?
11. What evidence do you have to confirm that the RESPONDANT exists?





# CLC Embassy

12. If you can confirm the RESPONDANT exists, you are required to forward to me a copy of this information and to also submit this evidence to the public record of the court.

This is required to confirm that you can demonstrate, you have probable cause to raise this action.

13. Is the RESPONDANT able to do business in this country?

14. Is the RESPONDANT being represented by a Board of Directors?

15. If you have a problem with the RESPONDANT, why have you not issued your charges to the Board of Directors or the CEO of the corporation.

Why are you sending correspondence to the RESPONDANT at another address?

16. As owner of the PERSON that you refer to, where is the probable cause to confirm that I have anything to do with the RESPONDANT?

17. Are you aware that the RESPONDANT's name has appeared as a traded security and brokerage account?

18. Can you confirm that you have named the RESPONDANT in this action and that you have sent the correspondence to an address in Wormit.

19. As I am a living man, you are required to confirm that I am not an incorporated entity and not a traded and bonded security, should this action proceed.

20. Can you demonstrate and explain to the court exactly why you have addressed the RESPONDANT in relation to this issue?

## ADDITIONAL NOTES

If the event that this matter was to proceed, the companies involved would be guilty of failing to comply with The United Nations Universal Declaration on Human Rights (1948), specifically the Articles below:

**i) Article 4**

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





# CLC Embassy

- ii) **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 discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.*
  
- iii) **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.*
  
- iv) **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.*
  
- v) **Article 18**  
*Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.*
  
- vi) **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.
  
- vii) **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.*

In addition to the above, I write to confirm that the following points are relevant to this case.

It has become clear that under the Clearfield Doctrine (Exhibit 5), which I am sure you are fully aware of,

Muir Myles Lavery, Meadowplace Building, Dundee, DD1 1EJ  
(D-U-N-S Number: 548933134)  
(see Exhibit 6)





# *CLC Embassy*

&

Dundee Sheriff Court, West Bell Street, Dundee, DD1 1EX  
(Company Number: L43249324)  
(see Exhibit 7)

have been operating as commercial enterprises, without full disclosure to men and women who were deceived into believing them to be a lawful legal practice and a lawful court.

Commercial enterprises can ONLY operate with full disclosure, by mutual contractual consent and with equal consideration, this you have failed to do and have intentionally committed fraud with menaces in order to make a financial gain, this of course is unacceptable and will require immediate redress. Due to the failure to disclose the terms, conditions and the lack of a lawful contract that has been agreed and seen by all parties involved, you are required to produce the full terms and conditions, signed contracts and indemnity insurances for a claim to be made.

As this also applies to DUNDEE SHERIFF COURT there is irrefutable evidence of clear profit-making practices from both companies which confirms a fraud upon the people, who no longer find this acceptable.

This document is not an application and does not form part of an appeal. It is presented as a challenge to the authority and jurisdiction of the court and a lawful notice, there has been identifiable defects in procedure, including the use of fraud, and an abuse of process by the private companies known as Muir Myles and Laverty and Dundee Sheriff Court.

**I also wish to clarify that I will be challenging the issue of Slavery.**

In the event that this matter is still in dispute, I, John Smith, a living man, am happy to attend a hearing for clarification purposes only but will require at least a minimum of twenty-eight (28) days notice, as I will first require an answer to this notice.

In the event of such a hearing to address this issue, any individual appointed to deal with this may only do so if they are mentally stable. This individual would need to be of sound mind, and they would also be required to recognise the position of a living man appearing before them as failure to do so would render them incompetent to deal with this issue. This individual may not use criminal coercion to assist them, and they should not be able to converse with a dead entity (also known as a person) as to do so would also render them mentally unstable and not fit to deal with this issue.

It should also be noted that as I do not consent to this hearing my position is that there is **no case to answer**. In the event that any plea has previously been entered on my behalf, I will be raising a complaint, as the individual entering the plea would be guilty of war crimes, in addition to torture, genocide, and slavery.





## *CLC Embassy*

In addition to the above I also refer you to the following **Supreme Court Rulings** which establishes my position as a living man, these are applicable to this case:

1. That the following Supreme Court Ruling confirms the following:

**Trinsey v. Pagliaro D.C.Pa. 1964, 229 F. Supp. 647**

**“An attorney for the plaintiff cannot admit evidence into the court. He is either an attorney or a witness”.**

The defendants’ motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim unsupported by affidavits or depositions is incomplete because it requests this Court to consider facts outside the record which have not been presented in the form required by Rules 12(b)(6) and 56(c). Statements of counsel in their briefs or argument while enlightening to the Court are not sufficient for purposes of granting a motion to dismiss or summary judgment.

2. That the following **Supreme Court Ruling** confirms the unlawful behaviour of the various parties:

**Montgomery vs State 55 Fla. 97-45S0.879.**

S. 54; 1 L.Ed. 57; 3 Dall. 54),

### **SUPREME COURT RULING – NO CORPORATE JURISDICTION OVER THE NATURAL MAN**

**Supreme Court of the United States 1795**, “Inasmuch as every government is an artificial person, an abstraction, and a creature of the mind only, a government can interface only with other artificial persons. The imaginary, having neither actuality nor substance, is foreclosed from creating and attaining parity with the tangible. The legal manifestation of this is that no government, as well as any law, agency, aspect, court, etc. can concern itself with anything other than corporate, artificial persons and the contracts between them.” S.C.R. 1795, (3 U.S. 54; 1 L.Ed. 57; 3 Dall. 54).

3. That the following **Supreme Court Ruling** confirms the unlawful behaviour of the various parties:

**U.S. Supreme Court - Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43 (1906)**

Hale v. Henkel - No. 340  
Argued January 4, 5, 1906  
Decided March 12, 1906  
201 U.S. 43





# CLC Embassy

## The Decision of the United States Supreme Court states:

"The **"individual"** may stand upon "his Constitutional Rights" as a CITIZEN. He is entitled to carry on his **"private"** business **in his own way**. "His power to contract is unlimited." **He owes no duty to the State** or to his neighbors to divulge his business, or **to open his doors to an investigation**, so far as it may tend to incriminate him. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing therefrom, beyond the protection of his life and property. **"His rights"** are such as **"existed"** by the **Law of the Land (Common Law) "long antecedent"** to the organization of the State" and can only be taken from him by "due process of law", and "in accordance with the Constitution." "He owes nothing" to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights."

4. The subject of **SLAVERY** has been addressed by many countries and it is deemed to be abhorrent at all levels, a case in question was heard in the United States of America's Supreme Court and I state that this is applicable to the companies known as **MUIR MYLES LAVERTY** and **DUNDEE SHERIFF COURT**.

*United States v. Schooner Amistad,  
40 U.S. (15 Pet.) 518 (1841)*

*This case was considered in 1839 with a decision in 1841*

*John Quincy Adams  
(Former United States President)  
confirmed the following:*

*When a living man appears in court to confirm his standing, he should be acknowledged as a hero and rewarded with medals, he should be recorded as a hero and our children should be told about him, but this court will not even acknowledge him as living and have prosecuted him as a **LEGAL PERSON/LEGAL ENTITY** and **NOT HUMAN**.*

*If the Supreme Court were to adopt a similar position to the South and the prosecution of the slaves, it would be confirming that living men and women with certain inherent, lawful, legal and moral rights were free to engage in insurrection with those who would deny them their freedom.*

*John Quincy Adams then asked,*

*"If the Supreme Court were to take the position of the South, in relation to slavery, and that it was correct, what that would mean to the Declaration of Independence?"*





# CLC Embassy

*John Quincy Adams then suggested that,*

*If the Supreme Court were to agree with the South, we should just tear up the Declaration of Independence, as the rights of living men and women no longer matter.*

*John Quincy Adams was successful in this case, freeing the slaves concerned.*

Can you confirm if this is the position that companies known as MUIR MYLES LAVERTY and DUNDEE SHERIFF COURT wish to adopt in relation to this case?

I would take this further and say that this is also applicable to the following documents: **Magna Carta 1215**, the **Declaration of Arbroath 1320**, the **King James Bible 1611** the **Bills of Rights 1689**, and the **Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948**, which established the freedoms of all living men and women.

## Additional Note

Unless you can confirm that the companies known as MUIR MYLES LAVERTY and DUNDEE SHERIFF COURT have superior authority to that of the people, the Common Law Court, the Supreme Court, the United Nations and God, you would be complicit in committing crimes against the people if this matter is not dealt with correctly.

While MUIR MYLES LAVERTY and DUNDEE SHERIFF COURT are confirmed companies, they have no authority or jurisdiction over a living man. In addition, as I do not consent to this hearing and as no lawful contract has been produced, this action must be dismissed immediately.

To further clarify, I refer you to the following video as this is also applicable to your position.

<https://rumble.com/v3jjkde-proof-the-police-are-a-business.html>

## IN CONCLUSION

I wish to confirm that if this matter should proceed, I will require the court to dismiss this action, for failure to state a case and failure to identify the nature and identities of the parties being addressed in this claim.

In the event that you choose to ignore this and wish to proceed with this issue, I will require a date for a hearing to enable a challenge to your authority, jurisdiction and that of DUNDEE





# CLC Embassy

SHERIFF COURT. This challenge would not be time-barred as it involves the following issues, war crimes, fraud and slavery.

If you fail to cease further action, or to consent to a date for my challenge hearing, I will require you to confirm –

1. By what authority do you rely on, to justify your position?
2. What authority do you rely on to establish your right to assist with an action against a living man? and
3. I also require you to provide a copy of your **Policy for Compliance** with the **Slavery Act 2015**.

I put it to you that this case is the most important one to come before you as it concerns the very nature of a living man and slavery.

Your actions and those of the MUIR MYLES LAVERTY and DUNDEE SHERIFF COURT will have a huge bearing on this issue.

*John Smith*

*CLC Diplomat, Living man &  
Cruinn Community Member*

Standing under the authority and  
jurisdiction of the Common Law Court

