

## ON JUDGES

The Sovereign, through the provisions of the Coronation Oath Act, 1688, personally subscribes to a statutory contract relative to England and its dominions, to inter alia "governe the people...according to the statutes in Parlyament agreed on", that is, to solely and in their proper person "maintaine the statutes laws and customs of the..realme and all the people", and particularly in pursuit of such foundational laws and government in both "England and the dominions thereto belonging", to "cause law and justice in mercy to be executed in all..judgements".

Established primarily for the continuance of stable governance by succeeding sovereigns, such Coronation Oath has long been held to define the "basic contract between Crown and people" which the Sovereign as tenant/lessee of the Crown personally makes as its representative.

Since the only person to enter into a statutory contract regarding governance and justice in Crown realms is the sovereign, the upholding of all laws and judgements pursuant to such, including punishment as a remedy for offences, must be effected by the sovereign as the sole contractee with the Crown. Ultimately there is no other provision in law for any other person to ensure the judging of such causes than the Sovereign as by law established, that is, the Sovereign as bound to be obedient to the terms of the Coronation oath is the only person statutorily empowered to govern nations and guarantee lawful judgements, no other person being given such superintending statutory authority.

Further, all breaches of law or offences under the Crown are deemed to "run in the King's name", the same meaning that all breaches of law are considered offences against the person of the Sovereign, and not against the institutions of Sovereignty or the Crown, the law considering that the legal injury caused by the offence is done to the person of the Sovereign and is remedial by the same, with the Crown being inanimate and unable to effect remedies as justice requires.

But at common law and since Biblical times, no person has been legally allowed to judge a matter in their own cause. Accordingly, the Sovereign is not allowed to be a judge despite being deemed the only injured party under the Crown and either named or expressly implied as responsible for the remedying of offences.

However, being so confined to the terms of the Coronation Oath Act and unable to act as judge in their own matters, sovereigns can thus only delegate their power of judgement to others, that is, to selected persons versed in law, they so becoming empowered as judges only by their having adopted the terms of the relevant statutory oath, and then personally adopting what amounts in law to the Sovereign's will and conscience as by law established, their own private will and conscience notwithstanding.

## 2.

On close reading of the terms of the Coronation Oath Act, such specifies that judgements are required by oath to be made not according to constitutionally repugnant laws and political practices or in deference to a collective body of judges, but obedient to the already settled constitutional laws and customs governing the populace, as a continuing ground for the necessary statutes and laws accompanying social development. That is, such political changes as tend to usurp the power of the Crown in its established government, stand invalid by repugnancy to the common law terms of the coronation oath (the common law being the source from which all valid statutes gain their force).

Therefore in 'doing their office', judges are required under the common law terms of their statutory oaths (contracts) of allegiance etc., to give effect to the legislation and judgements of the Sovereign. To act in a manner which tends to diminish the need for obedience to such sovereign requirements renders void the basic contract made with the Sovereign, and hence any such judge so acting is deemed to do so outside the authority of law.

Although under the Crown, judges are allowed a variation of conclusions drawn from evidence, such variation is not permitted to extend to exercising their own private will or conscience. Only the Sovereign may do such, but similarly only in accord with the laws and customs long established, thus preserving those nations governed under the Crown. It may be argued that because such judges are not to exercise their own will or conscience, the Crown grants high legal and civil privileges to the same.

Thus all judgements are compelled by law to be made according to the fundamental 'law of the land' as has been settled since at least 1688, despite numerous attempts to pervert it.

If judges judge according to their own will and conscience as opposed to that of Sovereigns (governing according to the terms of the coronation oath), they act not just outside their jurisdiction but in violation of their statutory contract to judge for the Sovereign, and on so doing become technically 'not a judge', and actionable.

That is, in such a case of being technically 'not a judge' (rampant in present times) and accordingly unprotected by judicial privilege, the law in its own eye does not hold such judge to be legitimate, and provides that the same shall be liable for prosecution in their private capacity as an ordinary person found to have committed an offence. And with wilful breaches of the contractual statutory oath being not included in "judicial privilege" allowances, and the matter standing remedial at common law, a legal maxim applicable to the level of remedy required is "The higher the person, the higher the crime", therefore the higher the penalty to be administered.