

# "Special" Admiralty Courts

By Anna Von Reitz



We have been the victims of many, many deceptions, and none greater than the misrepresentation of Military District Courts as the courts of the people.

The military districts and the courts attached to them were instituted in May of 1865 by the British Territorial United States Government ---an institution that is only approved to exist under the terms and conditions of the actual Constitution of the United States of America (1789), and the Treaty of Paris (1783), which lacked the specific implementation provided by the Constitution referenced.

There is no other basis to assume a contract.

There are two kinds of actual courts on offer -- Maritime (British Commercial) and Admiralty Courts that have usurped upon the land jurisdiction courts of this country--- plus the so-called "Administrative Courts" which aren't actual courts at all, but are instead internal corporation tribunals.

1. If you voluntarily enter the premises of these courts (inside the railing separating the court from the gallery) you are presumed to be granting them jurisdiction.
2. If you argue about anything, you are presumed to be granting them jurisdiction.
3. If you obey their judge about anything, even as simple as telling you to sit down, they assume jurisdiction.
4. If you accept being called "Mister" or "Missus" or "Miss" or "Doctor" or "Sir", etc. you are accepting titles, and presumed to be a British Territorial Subject--- granting jurisdiction to their court.
5. You are considered guilty until proven innocent in these courts -- the exact opposite of our courts.
6. If dragged into one of these courts under arrest or warrant, they give you a choice between "guilty" and "not guilty", but this is a False Choice which precludes the possibility that you are "innocent". So you must know enough about their system to plead "Innocent" or, again, they will assume jurisdiction and railroad you.

So, how else do these courts work and what are their weaknesses?

1. They must have a contract to examine and rule upon. If there is no contract for service, no contract in dispute, and no contract in evidence, they have no case and no reason to address you. So ask, politely, where's the contract?

They may bring up the State-of-State Constitution, or even the Federal Constitutions, but you are not a party subject to them, so, you ask, "When was I informed and given full disclosure for my consent?"

They won't have any answers, because in fact none of the Constitutions apply to normal folk --- only to those who work for the government and those who contract at a high level for the government services, and that isn't you.

If you press them and keep on point, asking pointed questions, they will have no reply, because they don't have a contract with you.

2. They have no defense against questions and questions do not allow them to seize jurisdiction, so you bedevil them with questions. You turn everything they claim into a countering question.

Example:

The Prosecutor claims, "The DEFENDANT owes income taxes for the years 2003 to 2019."

You ask, politely, "Where's the contract obligating me to pay taxes owed by the US DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE?"

3. These courts live and die by Negative Averment -- that is, according to what should be-- and isn't-- present.

So, asking for the contract which should be there, -----and isn't, is key.

Asking for the source of purported "federal income" is key.

Whatever should reasonably be present and isn't, is what you ask about.

May I see the Prosecutor's Bid Bond?

If he can't produce his Bid Bond on the case, there is no case, and you can innocently ask, "If there's no Bid Bond, then, how can there be a case?"

And there can't be, so Mr. Prosecutor has to pay the court, and the charges against YOU get dismissed.

And isn't that a good turn around?

-----

See this article and over 4300 others on Anna's website here: [www.annavonreitz.com](http://www.annavonreitz.com)

To support this work look for the Donate button on this website.