

# 2nd Successful process used against HMRC.

DAVID ROBINSON · TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2017 ·

[This is the second time we have successfully rebutted fines from HMRC.

Sandi had received another demand from HMRC to pay fines for not submitting an income tax form on time, she had already paid earlier demands when she was threatened with enforcement against her if she did not pay. She is a home owner and has some assets so naturally she was concerned about the threats, she like others assumed that those that had already had success against the regime by using article 61 (in various other matters) were those who have very little to lose, and that, although that is true, this is why they gave up on those successful pioneers. With the greatest of respect to Sandi (and others that have made such an assumption) I trust now that this success is proof enough that this is not the case.

Sandi is part of the lawful rebellion group in Glastonbury. After she witnessed the earlier success against HMRC pioneered by another group member Edward Alder. She decided to pluck up the courage to have a go. She always knew that she could simply pay up under duress of circumstances if things got too heavy, this is a safety net that is completely lawful to do if you are in lawful rebellion. By doing so you are not admitting liability and will have obtained evidence of theft. This evidence can and will be used against those agents of the corrupt regime once the rebellion has been ultimately successful, and it will be.

I offered to handle the process for her as she didn't know how to proceed. I also had the intent to use the previous success Eddy had used as a precedent within the process, but it didn't even get that far. Sandi agreed to provide me with power of attorney over the matter, here is the contract that we agreed....]

Sandra Wicks.  
xxxxxxxxxxx,  
Glastonbury.  
Somerset.  
BA6

I Sandra Wicks do hereby authorize David Paul Robinson to act with power of attorney on my behalf, with regard to any enforcement agency attempting to remove goods or monies with regard to council tax or any other matter involving the law, unless or until I have withdrawn my authority in writing. Sandra Wicks.

Signed:

Dated:  
David Robinson.  
C/o The King Arthur,  
31-33 Benedict Street,  
Glastonbury,  
Somerset.

BA6 9NB.

I, David Robinson of sound mind and good intent, do solemnly swear to act in accordance with the rule of law at all times, with power of attorney in any affairs with regard to the law and, for no personal financial gain whatsoever for Sandra Wicks., whilst upholding the laws of the land without deviation.

Signed:

Dated:

Witnessed by:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

-----  
[I rebutted the demand by using the Notice of Conditional Acceptance (as we do).]  
To: Mrs C Graham (doing business as an officer of revenue and customs for HMRC).  
HMRC DMB 380  
BX5 5AB

From: Sandra Wicks xxxxxxxx xxxxxx, xx xxxx xxxx , Glastonbury. Somerset. BA6  
Tax ref: xxxxx xxxxxx  
Date Notice served: 24th October 2015  
Sent by recorded post.

**NOTICE OF CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE.** Notice to Agent is Notice to Principle.

Dear Mrs C Graham,

I am writing to you after I received a demand for a payment of £1,200.00 for 'Overdue Tax, Tax Return & Penalties' dated 8th October 2015.

Please be aware that this is a Notice, a lawful instrument that requires your urgent attention. This 'Notice of Conditional Acceptance' may be used as evidence in my defence.

Whereas I, Sandra Wicks, stand entirely under the tenets of constitutional law in lawful rebellion as to my duty under the law and, that it is to my understanding entirely unlawful to pay any monies to HMRC at this time and since the 23rd March 2001 and, that I have withdrawn ANY/ALL presumed allegiance to the office of Sovereign (including HMRC) due to my individual duties under the law (see exhibit 'D', Oath of allegiance to the Committee of the Barons), those duties being stated within Article 61 of Magna Carta 1215 (see exhibit 'C', Article 61 of Magna Carta 1215 text), invoked by royal command according to the correct protocols of constitutional law on the 23rd day of March 2001 (See exhibit 'B', Letters between the barons' committee and the office of sovereign), therefore the law forbids me to comply with your demands for monies.

Whereas it cannot be denied that the invocation of this most important constitutional tenet did occur on the aforesaid date and, that it stands as the CURRENT LAW of the realm, please provide me evidence in substance to counter this claim within 7 (Seven) days from your receipt of this 'Notice of Conditional Acceptance' and I shall comply with your demand for payment. I do not wish to break the law Mrs Graham, if I am coerced/forced under threat into breaking the law by you, then you shall be solely liable for the consequences.

Maxim in law: **“Any act done by me against my will is not my act”.**

The Daily Telegraph reported on the invocation of Article 61 of Magna Carta 1215 on the 24th March 2001. An article by Caroline Davis (see exhibit 'A') which can also be viewed online under the title 'Peers petition Queen on Europe'.

Magna Carta Society wrote: The House of Lords Records Office confirmed in writing as

recently as last September (2009) that Magna Carta, sealed by King John in June 1215, stands to this day. Home Secretary Jack Straw said as much on 1 October 2000, when the Human Rights Act came into force. Halsbury's Laws of England says: "Magna Carta is as binding upon the Crown today as it was the day it was sealed at Runnymede."

Therefore I, Sandi Wicks does conditionally accept that HMRC has the lawful authority to make demands on me for tax or fines, on proof that Article 61 of Magna Carta 1215 is no longer in effect today and, that the ratification of the treaty of Nice has been revoked and, that the crown does indeed, according to British Constitution law, have the legal/lawful authority to make and enforce such demands.

Whilst the law provides me with 'lawful excuse' to distress the crown and its institutions at this time, it is to my understanding that I CANNOT BY LAW consent to the fine demanded by you as an officer for HMRC. British constitutional law forbids me to aid and abet the crown until Article 61 has been revoked by the barons' committee. It also forbids me to aid and abet any other man or woman who is not also standing in open rebellion in compliance with the law under Article 61 of Magna Carta 1215. I must also compel you Mrs C Graham to abide by the constitutional law yourself, and to stand with us in lawful rebellion as the law demands.

Failure to respond to this 'Notice of conditional acceptance' within the time frame allotted, or without providing evidence in substance that clearly defines that article 61 is no longer in effect, shall be taken to mean by all interested parties (including third party interlopers) that HMRC has NO lawful claim against I, Sandi Wicks and, that any further attempt to extract monies or goods over this matter would be harassment which may invoke a counter claim for damages against HMRC and you personally Mrs C Graham. Any reply must be made on your full commercial liability and on penalty of perjury. We are ALL responsible and culpable for our own actions or omissions under British Constitutional law. Please check the facts for yourself before replying. Ignorance is no defence in law.

Sincerely, without any admission of liability whatsoever and, with no attempt to deceive or to appear vexatious and, with all my inalienable Constitutional rights reserved.

Signed: Sandi Wicks.

Witnessed by:

Signature. Printed name: Date:

1.----- 2.-----  
----- 3.-----  
-----

Enclosed evidence.

Exhibit 'A' (Daily Telegraph reported on the invocation of Article 61 of MC 1215 on the 24th March 2001).

Exhibit 'B' (communications between the Committee of the Baron and Sir Robin Janvrin, Queens private secretary)

Exhibit 'C' (Article 61 of MC 1215 text)

Exhibit 'D' (Oath of allegiance to the Committee of the Barons).

EXHIBIT 'A'.

Peers Petition Queen on Europe. Daily Telegraph.

By Caroline Davies

12:00: AM GMT 24 Mar 2001

"FOUR peers invoked ancient rights under the Magna Carta yesterday to petition the Queen to block closer integration with Europe.

The Duke of Rutland, Viscount Masserene and Ferrard, Lord Hamilton of Dalzell and Lord Ashbourne were imbued with the spirit of the ancient Charter, thrust on King John in 1215. In accordance with the Charter's Clause 61, the famous enforcement clause, the four presented a vellum parchment at Buckingham Palace, declaring that the ancient rights and freedoms of the British people had to be defended.

The clause, one of the most important in the Charter, which was pressed on King John at Runnymede, allows subjects of the realm to present a quorum of 25 barons with a

petition, which four of their number then have to take to the Monarch, who must accept it. It was last used in 1688 at the start of the Glorious Revolution.

The four peers, who were all thrown out of Parliament in November 1999, proved they had that quorum by presenting Sir Robin Janvrin, the Queen's private secretary, with the petition signed by 28 hereditaries and letters of support from another 60. In addition, they claim the support of thousands of members of the public.

They say that several articles in the Treaty of Nice agreed by Tony Blair in December will destroy fundamental British liberties. The Queen has 40 days to respond. Under the Magna Carta's provisions, if the Sovereign does not observe the Charter the people may rise up and wage war on her, seizing castles, lands and possessions until they have redress.”

EXHIBIT 'B'.

The petition of the barons and letters from both parties in full.

The Petition.

A Petition to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II presented under clause 61 of Magna Carta 1215 7th February 2001.

To Defend British Rights and Freedoms.

Ma'am,

as our humble duty, we draw to Your Majesty's attention:

1. The loss of our national independence and the erosion of our ancient rights, freedoms and customs since the United Kingdom became a member of the European Economic Community (now the European Union) in 1973;
  2. The terms of the Treaty of Nice, 2000, which, if ratified, will cause significant new losses of national independence, and further imperil the rights and freedoms of the British people, by surrendering powers to the European Union:
    - a) to enter into international treaties binding on the United Kingdom, without the consent of your Government;
    - b) to ban political parties, deny free association and restrict the free expression of political opinion;
    - c) which can be used to introduce an alien system of criminal justice, abolish the ancient British rights of habeas corpus and trial by jury, and allow onto British soil men-at-arms from other countries with powers of enforcement;
    - d) to create a military force which will place British service personnel under the command of the European Union without reference to British interests, and contrary to:
      - i) the oath of personal loyalty to the Crown sworn by British forces,
      - ii) the Queen's Commission, and
      - iii) the United Kingdom's obligations to the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation;
    - e) which remove the United Kingdom's right to veto decisions not in British interests;
  3. The creation by the European Union of a Charter of Fundamental Rights, which purports to give it the power to abolish such "rights" at will;
  4. The unlawful use of the Royal Prerogative to
    - a) suspend or offend against statutes in ways which are prejudicial and detrimental to your sovereignty, contrary to the Coronation Oath Act, 1688;
    - b) subvert the rights and liberties of your loyal subjects, contrary to the ruling in *Nichols v Nichols*, 1576;
  5. Your Majesty's power to withhold the Royal Assent, and the precedent set by Queen Anne under a similar threat to the security of the Realm in 1707;
- WHEREFORE it is our humble duty TO PETITION Your Majesty to withhold the Royal Assent from any Parliamentary Bill which attempts to ratify the Treaty of Nice unless and until the people of the United Kingdom have given clear and specific approval to uphold and preserve the rights, freedoms and customs of your loyal subjects as set out in Magna Carta and the Declaration of Rights, which you, our Sovereign, swore before the nation to uphold and preserve in your Coronation Oath of June 1953.
- We have the honour to be Your Majesty's loyal and obedient subjects.

(signed)

**Notes:**

The House of Lords Records Office confirmed in writing as recently as last September that Magna Carta, signed by King John in June 1215, stands to this day. Home Secretary Jack Straws said as much on 10 October 2000, when the Human Rights Act came into force. Halsbury's Laws of England says: "Magna Carta is as binding upon the Crown today as it was the day it was sealed at Runnymede."

The Treaty of Nice signed by the British Government in December 2000 includes: Article 24 –transforms the EU into an independent state with powers to enter into treaties with other states which would then be binding on all member states, subject to agreement determined by Qualified Majority Voting.

Article 23 allows the EU to appoint its own representatives in other countries, effectively with ambassadorial status.

Article 191 –assumes for the EU the right to "lay down regulations governing political parties at European level [ie: in the EU]" and withdraw or prevent the funding of political parties which do not "contribute to forming a European awareness." This is a clear restriction of free speech and free political association. It also introduces two particularly abhorrent propositions – taxation without representation and the use of sanctions to suppress public opinion.

Articles 29 and 31 – establish common policing and judicial cooperation (Eurojust).

Article 67 allows matters of justice and home affairs to be agreed by QMV. These articles open the door to the imposition of *Corpus Juris* on the UK (article 31 specifically calls for cross-border policing and prosecution, and the removal of conflicts of jurisdiction), and the deployment of armed Europol law enforcement officers on the streets of Britain.

These matters were originally dealt with under article 280, which mysteriously disappeared from the draft of the Nice Treaty at the very last minute, in part at least following heavy pressure from British euro-realists.

Article 17 –establishes a common foreign and defence policy for the EU, with its own military force. The House of Commons was told on 11 December 2000, that:

"The entire chain of command must remain under the political control and strategic direction of the EU. NATO will be kept informed." Her Majesty The Queen is Commander in Chief of all her armed forces and Colonel in Chief of 46 of Her Regiments of the British army, every other regiment owing its loyalty directly via another member of, The Royal Family as its Colonel in Chief to Her Majesty.

The loss of the UK veto applies to 39 new areas of EU "competence", including indirect taxation, the environment, immigration, trade, employment, industrial policy, and regional funding. The EU also has plans for QMV to be expended to other areas not agreed at Nice, and without further treaty negotiations.

Charter of Fundamental Rights – signed at Biarritz, autumn 2000.

Article 52 purports to give the EU the power to abolish them at will, effectively making them meaningless. The whole proposition that the state has the right to grant and abolish fundamental human rights [ie: those we inherit at birth and hold in trust for future generations] is not only absurd but also contrary to Magna Carta 1215, the Declaration of Rights, 1688, and the Bill of Rights 1689.

Clause 61 of Magna Carta was last invoked when the Bishop of Salisbury (Gilbert Burnet) acted on behalf of the barons and bishops of England to invite William of Orange and Mary to come to London in 1688, after King James II had failed to re-establish Roman Catholicism in England, and lost the confidence of the people. His act of abdication was to throw the Great Seal into the Thames and flee the country.

The ruling in *Nichols v Nichols* 1576 included the words: "Prerogative is created for the benefit of the people and cannot be exercised to their prejudice." (The Royal Prerogative is the power delegated by the sovereign to ministers to sign treaties on behalf of the nation.)

In 1707, Queen Anne withheld the Royal Assent from the Scottish Militia Bill when it became apparent that James Francis Stuart (pretender Prince of Wales, and the Queen's half-brother) was planning with Louis XIV of France to invade Scotland from Calais in an attempt to establish a Jacobite sovereign. Were such an invasion to be successful, the

Queen feared a Scottish militia might be turned against the monarchy. Thus, parliament's will was denied in the interests of the sovereignty of the nation and the security of the realm.

Addressing both Houses of Parliament on 20 July 1988, at an historic meeting of both houses to mark the 300th anniversary of the Declaration of Rights, Her Majesty said that it was "still part of statute law...on which the whole foundation and edifice of our parliamentary democracy rests." The Declaration of Rights spelt out the details: "...the said Lords...and Commons, being the two Houses of Parliament, should continue to sit and...make effectual provision for the settlement of the ...laws and liberties of this kingdom, so that the same for the future might not be in danger again of being subverted. ...the particulars aforesaid shall be firmly and strictly holden and observed...and all officers and ministers whatsoever shall serve their Majesties and their successors according to the same, in all time to come."

Both Magna Carta and the Declaration of Rights are contracts between the sovereign and the people. Because they are not statute law they cannot be repealed. Both proclaimed what were taken to be self-evident freedoms which exist by right. Equally, both were based on a concept of permanence.

List Of Signatories Peers signing the petition:

Lord Ashbourne, The Duke of Rutland, Viscount Massereene & Ferrard (as Lord Oriel), Lord Hamilton of Dalzell signed and presented the petition at Buckingham Palace.

The petition was also signed by:

Lord Sudeley, Viscount Cowdray, Viscount Norwich, Lord Napier & Ettrick, Earl of Romney,

Earl Kitchener, Lord Napier of Magdala, Lord Ailsa, Lord Sandys, Earl Cathcart, Lord Oaksey, Lord Milne, Lord Newall, Lord Barber of Tewkesbury, Lord Dormer, Viscount Exmouth, Lord Wise, Earl of Devon, Earl of Cromer, Earl of Shannon (as Lord Carleton), Lord Sandford, Marquis of Aberdeen (as Earl Aberdeen), Lord Strathcarron, Lord Craigmyle. The Countess of Dysart also signed, but the Dysart title is Scottish and pre-dates the Union of 1707.

Letter To The Queens Private Secretary

Sir Robin Janvrin, KCVO, CB Principal Private Secretary to Her Majesty The Queen  
Buckingham Palace London.

23 March 2001.

You were kind enough to invite a letter of amplification to accompany our petition to Her Majesty. Thank you.

The Treaty of Nice raises issues of major constitutional importance. It directly threatens our rights and freedoms, and undermines oaths of loyalty to the Crown. Such fundamental matters cannot be considered merely the stuff of day-to-day politics. They directly concern the Crown, the constitution and every British subject, including generations yet unborn.

We find ourselves living in exceptional times, which call for exceptional measures.

Hence our petition to Her Majesty, which exercises rights unused for over 300 years – clause 61 of Magna Carta, which were reinforced by article 5 of the Bill of Rights.

As you know, the wording of clause 61 says: ...and, laying the transgression before us, petition to have that transgression redressed without delay...And we shall procure nothing from anyone, directly or indirectly, whereby any part of these concessions and liberties might be revoked or diminished; and if any such things has been procured, let it be void and null.

We have petitioned Her Majesty to withhold the Royal Assent from any Bill seeking to ratify the Treaty of Nice because there is clear evidence (which we shall address in a moment) that it is in direct conflict with the Constitution of the United Kingdom. It conflicts with Magna Carta, with the Declaration and Bill of Rights and, above all, with Her Majesty's Coronation Oath and the Oaths of Office of Her Majesty's ministers. Every one of these protections stand to this day, which is why they are now being invoked by our petition.

Ultimately, our supreme protection is Her Majesty's obligations under the Coronation Oath. The Queen has solemnly promised to govern the peoples of the United Kingdom according to the Statutes in Parliament agreed on and according to their laws and customs. Her Majesty also swore to preserve all rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain to any of them.

From the spiritual point of view, it is unimaginable that Her Majesty would seek, in effect, a divorce from her duty. From a secular point of view, the Coronation Oath is a signed contract.

Recent statements by ministers, and by the previous prime minister, confirm that they would not advise any measure which might tend to breach the Coronation Oath nor betray Her Majesty's promise to her loyal subjects. Her Majesty accepts the advice of her ministers. Conversely, it is their duty to advise in accordance with the Coronation Oath. They cannot lawfully advise a breach. Nor can they gain or remain in power without swearing allegiance to the Crown. Yet the Treaty of Nice represents precisely such a breach, and it has now been signed by the foreign secretary using the Royal Prerogative. Blackstones Commentaries (volume 1, page 239) says of the Royal Prerogative: The splendour, rights, and powers of the Crown were attached to it for the benefit of the people. They form part of, and are, generally speaking, as ancient as the law itself. *De prerogativa regis* is merely declaratory of the common law...

The duties arising from the relation of sovereign and subject are reciprocal. Protection, that is, the security and governance of his dominions according to law, is the duty of the sovereign; and allegiance and subjection, with reference to the same criterion, the constitution and laws of the country, form, in return, the duty of the governed. We have already observed that the prerogatives are vested in him for the benefit of his subjects, and that his Majesty is under, and not above, the laws.

For such words to have meaning, the act of signing the Treaty of Nice by the foreign secretary demonstrates that ministers have *de facto* renounced their oaths of allegiance. Indeed, faced in due course with a Bill seek in gratification of the Treaty of Nice, the only options appear to be for Her Majesty to dissolve Parliament, or for the government to resign and fight an election on the issue. The ex-government would then be faced with seeking

elective power to introduce new oaths of loyalty under a new constitution as part of their new manifesto. This would distil the issues as perhaps nothing else might, since it would allow the people of the United Kingdom to decide whether or not they wished the constitution to be breached in this way, their rights and freedoms to be curtailed, and the position, powers and responsibilities of their sovereign to be diminished.

Of course, for the many thousands of subjects who have supported our petition, no such option exists. As the Act of Supremacy and the Bill of Rights put it: all usurped and foreign power and authority may forever be clearly extinguished, and never used or obeyed in this realm. no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate shall at any time after the last day of this session of Parliament, use, enjoy or exercise any manner of power, jurisdiction, superiority, authority, pre-eminence or privilege within this realm, but that henceforth the same shall be clearly abolished out of this realm, forever.

So it is clear that no-one – neither sovereign, nor parliament, no government, nor people – may tamper with, dismantle, destroy or surrender our constitution. We are all tenants of it, and trustees. We inherited these rights, and we have a supreme responsibility to pass them in good order to future generations. They are not ours to discard or diminish. Which is why oaths of allegiance place an essential limitation on parliament's power, and the Queens Coronation Oath is crucial. The Coronation Oath is a moral obligation, a religious obligation, a sworn obligation, a contractual obligation, a statutory obligation, a common law obligation, a customary obligation, an obligation on all who swear allegiance, it is the duty of government, and it is sworn for the nation, the commonwealth and all dominions.

The Coronation Oath is the peak of a pyramid, and all subordinate oaths are bound by its limitations. The armed services swear allegiance to the sovereign, not to the government of the day. This helps clarify the principle that allegiance is necessary, and not optional – an essential part of the checks and balances of our constitution. Without these oaths, and

their lawful enforcement, we have little to protect us from government by tyranny. We return now to our reasons for stating that the Treaty of Nice is unconstitutional. Our petition highlights several such clauses. We draw particular attention to article 191, which seeks to restrict the political freedom of Her Majesty's subject.

The EU seeks to assume the right to lay down regulations governing political parties at European level [ie: in the EU] and withdraw or prevent the funding of political parties which do not contribute to forming a European awareness. This is a clear restriction of free speech and free political association. It also introduces two particularly abhorrent propositions – taxation without representation and the use of state sanctions to suppress public opinion.

Our political freedom is absolute. The Bill of Rights says so. It cannot be limited in any way. Her Majesty is rightfully inscribed on our coins of the realm as Fid. Def. and Lib.Def. – Libertatis Defensor, Defender of the Freedom of the People.

It has been suggested to us that a referendum or plebiscite might be an acceptable response to the question of ratification of the Treaty of Nice, but we do not hold that view. A referendum or plebiscite which purported to make lawful the infringement of our common law rights would itself be unlawful.

We come back to the oath of allegiance. Magna Carta says: We will appoint as justices, constables, sheriffs, or other officials, only men that know the law of the realm and are minded to keep it well. . . . How can such officers of the Crown organize such a referendum or plebiscite? These procedures would also infringe articles 1, 2 and 4 of the Bill of Rights:

1. That the pretended power of Suspending of Lawes or the Execution of Lawes by Regall Authority without Consent of Parlyament is illegall. (This must include the Coronation Oath Act.)
2. That the pretended Power of Dispensing with Lawes or the Execution of Lawes by Regal Authoritie as it hath beene assumed and exercised of late is illegall.
4. That levying Money for or to the Use of the Crowne by pretence of Prerogative without Grant of Parlyament for longer time or in other manner than the same is or shall be granted is Illegall. (This is further protection of our common law rights.)

In the event that the Treaty of Nice is considered for Royal Assent we respectfully request that Her Majesty grant us an opportunity to examine the opinion of those who seek to alter our constitution by contrary advice. Accordingly, under those same terms of Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights quoted earlier, we the undersigned, and others– have formed a Barons Constitutional Committee to be available for consultation and to monitor the present situation as it develops..until redress has been obtained. We are and remain Her Majesty's most loyal and obedient subjects.

Ashbourne, Rutland, Massereene & Ferrard, Hamilton of Dalzell.

The Reply

“I am commanded by The Queen to reply to your letter of 23rd March and the accompanying petition to Her Majesty about the Treaty of Nice.

“The Queen continues to give this issue her closest attention. She is well aware of the strength of feeling which European Treaties, such as the Treaty of Nice, cause. As a constitutional sovereign, Her Majesty is advised by her Government who support this Treaty. As I am sure you know, the Treaty of Nice cannot enter force until it has been ratified by all Member States and in the United Kingdom this entails the necessary legislation being passed by Parliament.”

EXHIBIT 'C'.

Article 61 the whole text;

"61. Since, more-over, for God and the amendment of our kingdom and for the better allaying of the quarrel that has arisen between us and our barons, we have granted all these concessions, desirous that they should enjoy them in complete and firm endurance forever, we give and grant to them the underwritten security, namely, that the barons choose five and twenty barons of the kingdom, whomsoever they will, who shall be bound with all their might, to observe and hold, and cause to be observed, the peace and liberties we have granted and confirmed to them by this our present Charter, so that if we,



or our justiciar, or our bailiffs or any one of our officers, shall in anything be at fault towards anyone, or shall have broken any one of the articles of this peace or of this security, and the offense be notified to four barons of the foresaid five and twenty, the said four barons shall repair to us (or our justiciar, if we are out of the realm) and, laying the transgression before us, petition to have that transgression redressed without delay.

And if we shall not have corrected the transgression (or, in the event of our being out of the realm, if our justiciar shall not have corrected it) within forty days, reckoning from the time it has been intimated to us (or to our justiciar, if we should be out of the realm), the four barons aforesaid shall refer that matter to the rest of the five and twenty barons, **and those five and twenty barons shall, together with the community of the whole realm, distrain and distress us in all possible ways, namely, by seizing our castles, lands, possessions, and in any other way they can, until redress has been obtained as they deem fit, saving harmless our own person, and the persons of our queen and children**; and when redress has been obtained, they shall resume their old relations towards us.

And let whoever in the country desires it, swear to obey the orders of the said five and twenty barons for the execution of all the aforesaid matters, and along with them, to molest us to the utmost of his power; and we publicly and freely grant leave to everyone who wishes to swear, and we shall never forbid anyone to swear. All those, moreover, in the land who of themselves and of their own accord are unwilling to swear to the twenty five to help them in constraining and molesting us, we shall by our command compel the same to swear to the effect foresaid.

And if any one of the five and twenty barons shall have died or departed from the land, or be incapacitated in any other manner which would prevent the foresaid provisions being carried out, those of the said twenty five barons who are left shall choose another in his place according to their own judgment, and he shall be sworn in the same way as the others. Further, in all matters, the execution of which is entrusted, to these twenty five barons, if perchance these twenty five are present and disagree about anything, or if some of them, after being summoned, are unwilling or unable to be present, that which the majority of those present ordain or command shall be held as fixed and established, exactly as if the whole twenty five had concurred in this; and the said twenty five shall swear that they will faithfully observe all that is aforesaid, and cause it to be observed with all their might. And we shall procure nothing from anyone, directly or indirectly, whereby any part of these concessions and liberties might be revoked or diminished; and if any such things has been procured, let it be void and null, and we shall never use it personally or by another."

---

-  
[She received no reply from Mrs C Graham (doing business as an officer of revenue and customs for HMRC). Instead they chose to attempt to scare her into submission by using another agent (M. Mansha). Here was his reply]:

HM Revenue & Customs.

Debt Management Enforcement & Insolvency Service.

Centenary Way

1 St Blaise Way

Bradford West

Yorkshire

BD1 4XX

Date 6 November 2015 Our Ref XXXXX XXXXXXXXXXX

Dear Mrs Wicks

I have attached a statement of liability which shows your outstanding balance on our records. Please note the amount is still remains outstanding are if you wish to dispute this

you will need to contact the self assessment helpline.

SA Helpline [0300 200 3310](tel:03002003310) (help to complete tax return).

Your liability to tax is not dependant on HM Revenue & Customs meeting the conditions you seek to impose.

The amounts outstanding are due under legislation and your liability for these amounts is not dependant upon HM Revenue & Customs providing answers to the irrelevant questions you have posed.

I recommend that you arrange to pay your outstanding liability immediately. Failure to do so may result in HM Revenue & Customs taking enforcement action against you. Such as the use of a debt collection agency, removal and sales of your assets. County Court proceedings or bankruptcy proceedings.

I have nothing further to add to this and I consider the matter to be closed. Any further correspondence from you on this topic will not be responded to.

Yours sincerely

(signature)

M. Mansha

(attached document);

HM Revenue & Customs.

## STATEMENT OF LIABILITIES

Date 6 November 2015

MRS S V WICKS

Reference xxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Period ended Description unpaid amount.

05-04-2013 Interest on Late Filing Penalty

4.43 05-04-2013 Interest on Daily Penalty

26.55 05-04-2013 Interest on 6 month Late Filing Penalty

8.85 05-04-2013 Interest on 12 month Late Filing Penalty £ 47.46

4.16 05-04-2013 SA Daily Penalty £ 900.00 Interest To 06-11-2015

3.47 05-04-2014 SA 6 month Late Filing Penalty £ 300.00

Total unpaid amount £ 1247.46

Interest accruing per day, until payment £ 0.09

-----  
[Well.....that told her!! she'd better just pay up then right?

We then served the second Notice on Mrs Graham. We also drafted a special Notice for M. Mansha...]

To: Mrs C Graham (doing business as an officer of revenue and customs for HMRC).

HMRC DMB 380

BX5 5AB

From; Sandra Wicks. xxxxxxxx xxxxxx, xx xxxx xxxx , Glastonbury. Somerset. BA6

Date Notice served: 11/11/2015

**NOTICE OF DEFAULT AND OPPORTUNITY TO CURE** Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal. Notice to Principal is Notice to Agent

Dear Mrs C Graham,

I, Sandra wicks do declare the following to be true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

This is a lawful notice. Please read it carefully. It informs you. It means what it says. I do not stand under the Law Society's 'legalese' and there are no hidden meanings or interpretations beyond the simple English statements herein. If you fail to comply with this Notice then you will be deemed to be in absolute agreement with the points raised.

**Do not ignore it.**

A reply to this notice is REQUIRED and is to be made stating the respondent's clearly legible full name and on his or her full commercial liability and penalty of perjury. Your response is required within TEN (10) days from the recorded delivery date of this notice; failure to comply will represent your tacit acquiescence with the FACTS of this Notice or that you are unable to provide lawful proof - of-claim.

You are hereby put on Notice of my standing and the lawful facts. Do not ignore this Notice unless you agree to acquiesce to the facts, thereby agreeing in full with the lawful points that I made in the previous Notice served on you dated: 24-10-2015 and delivered by Royal Mail Recorded Delivery on 29-10-2015.

If you fail to respond in 'substance' or within the reasonable time limit afforded to you herein, and rebut the points raised within previous Notice(s) served, it shall be taken to mean by all parties that all points and concerns raised herein/therein are true and indisputable lawful fact and, that you agree to them entirely and without exception. It will also be taken to mean that any further action taken against myself as a living or legal fiction would be deemed by all interested parties to be unlawful harassment or coercion to commit crimes under common law. I, Sandra Wicks over the age of twenty one years, competent to witness and with first hand knowledge do say the following, that:

**STATEMENT OF FACTS:** I have asked you previously to provide the evidence to confirm or deny whether Article 61 of Magna Carta 1215 is still in effect at this time. I am concerned that by complying to the demands of HMRC that I shall be in breach of the laws of this land since said Article came into effect. I do not wish to break the law, so please advise me with the truth in law so that I may do the correct thing according to law. Being the second Notice to be served, I use this Notice as a reminder of the first, preceding Notice served and the fact that it was either ignored or not answered according to the points raised within it – in SUBSTANCE. Allowing for a reasonable time limit for you to respond to this 'Notice of Default and Opportunity to Cure' I provide a further TEN (10) days from your receipt of this document by recorded mail for you to reply in substance. I hereby offer you this further opportunity to rebut or confirm my understanding of the common law as referred to in my previous Notice(s) for you to remain in honour and, thus by doing so, enabling an opportunity to remedy this matter amicably or to provide clarification of the lawful facts as to my standing under Article 61. I hereby attest and affirm that all of the above is the truth and is my lawful understanding. Without malice, vexation, frivolity or ill will and on my full commercial liability and penalty of perjury and, with no admission of liability whatsoever and with my natural, indefeasible and unalienable rights reserved and all benefits waived.

Sworn and subscribed on the date of:

Printed: ..... Signed:

Witnessed by (autograph):

1: \_\_\_\_\_  
2: \_\_\_\_\_  
3: \_\_\_\_\_

-----  
[And the Notice to Stop for M. Mansha];

To: M Mansha (Doing business as A Debt Enforcement Agent for HM Revenue & Customs). Debt Management Enforcement & Insolvency Service.

Centenary Way,  
1 St Blaise Way,  
Bradford, West  
Yorkshire.  
BD1 4XX  
From: Sandra Wicks xxxxxx.  
Glastonbury.  
Somerset.  
BA6

Your reference xxxx xxxxxxxx  
Sent by recorded post.

Date: 16/11/2015

**NOTICE TO STOP.** Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal, Notice to Principal is Notice to Agent.

Dear M Mansha,

Whereas I, Sandra Wicks stand fully under British Constitutional law in defence of the Sovereignty of our nation at this time, which is to my understanding the lawful truth and duty of ALL British and Commonwealth subjects to do, and evidently so since Article 61 of Magna Carta 1215 came into effect on the 23rd March 2001 (see exhibits A & B) and, that I have complied with the law with 'lawful excuse' with regard to this matter (see exhibit C), that being in a peaceful and honourable manner, by putting you M. Mansha on notice of the evidential facts in an attempt to remedy this matter lawfully, and to inform you of your own duty under British Constitutional law.

By pledging an Oath of allegiance to one of the Committee of the barons whom invoked said article, it makes it my sworn duty to distress the present regime and this I do by 'Royal Command'. To my understanding it is entirely unlawful to aid and abet the crown or ANY of its agents at this time. I therefore demand that you do due diligence on this matter and STOP any further proceedings against me unless and until it has been evidenced that my understanding of the law is incorrect.

I, Sandra Wicks has 'lawful excuse' to “distress and distrain” the present regime until present constitutional wrongs have been remedied. Proceeding against me may make you personally liable for any torts or criminal acts committed against me, which may result in a counter claim for extortion and demanding monies with menaces if you do not immediately stop further enforcement actions against me, whilst ignoring the evidence herein provided.

Whereas you state within the letter I received from you dated 6 November 2015 “ Your liability to tax is not dependant on HM Revenue & Customs meeting the conditions you seek to impose”. Let me remind you that it is THE LAW that imposes these conditions on us ALL. You are personally responsible for your acts and omissions under the law just like everybody else!

You further wrote “ The amounts outstanding are due under legislation and your liability for these amounts is not dependent upon HM Revenue & Customs providing answers to the irrelevant questions you have posed”. Sir, the question that I pose is entirely relevant to the fact that it is UNLAWFUL to aid and abet TREASON AT COMMON LAW and thus to adhere to the demands of HM Revenue & Customs at this time. Ignore the evidence presented at your own Peril. Your statements are evidently seditious.

To conclude your letter you wrote that “ I have nothing further to add to this and I consider the matter to be closed. Any further correspondence from you on this topic will not be responded to”. If you fail to respond to the RELEVANT points of constitutional law herein, then by your acquiescence it shall be deemed to mean, by all interested parties involved in this matter, that you agree wholeheartedly with the facts I have stated and evidence that I have included. And that any further actions taken against me shall be considered harassment and criminal acts.

Any reply MUST be made on your full commercial liability and on penalty of perjury. Without any admission of liability whatsoever and, with all my inalienable common law rights reserved. With prejudice and written under duress and protest. On my full commercial liability and on penalty of perjury.

Maxim: “Actusme invito factus, non est meus actus.” – An act done by me against my will, is not my act.

Sandra Wicks.

Signed.

Witness 1.

Witness 2.

Witness 3.

Evidence included:

Exhibit A (Daily Telegraph report on the invocation of Article 61 of Magna Carta 1215).

Exhibit B (Letters between the committee of the barons and Sir Robin Janvrin)

Exhibit C (Article 61 text).

EXHIBIT A.

Peers Petition Queen on Europe. Daily Telegraph.

By Caroline Davies

12:00 AM GMT 24 Mar 2001.

“FOUR peers invoked ancient rights under the Magna Carta yesterday to petition the Queen to block closer integration with Europe.

The Duke of Rutland, Viscount Masserene and Ferrard, Lord Hamilton of Dalzell and Lord Ashbourne were imbued with the spirit of the ancient Charter, thrust on King John in 1215. In accordance with the Charter's Clause 61, the famous enforcement clause, the four presented a vellum parchment at Buckingham Palace, declaring that the ancient rights and freedoms of the British people had to be defended.

The clause, one of the most important in the Charter, which was pressed on King John at Runnymede, allows subjects of the realm to present a quorum of 25 barons with a petition, which four of their number then have to take to the Monarch, who must accept it. It was last used in 1688 at the start of the Glorious Revolution.

The four peers, who were all thrown out of Parliament in November 1999, proved they had that quorum by presenting Sir Robin Janvrin, the Queen's private secretary, with the petition signed by 28 hereditaries and letters of support from another 60. In addition, they claim the support of thousands of members of the public.

They say that several articles in the Treaty of Nice agreed by Tony Blair in December will destroy fundamental British liberties. The Queen has 40 days to respond. Under the Magna Carta's provisions, if the Sovereign does not observe the Charter the people may rise up and wage war on her, seizing castles, lands and possessions until they have redress.”

EXHIBIT B.

The petition of the barons and letters from both parties in full.

The Petition.

A Petition to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II presented under clause 61 of Magna Carta 1215

February 2001.

To Defend British Rights and Freedoms.

Ma'am,

as our humble duty, we draw to Your Majesty's attention:

1. The loss of our national independence and the erosion of our ancient rights, freedoms and customs since the United Kingdom became a member of the European Economic Community (now the European Union) in 1973;
2. The terms of the Treaty of Nice, 2000, which, if ratified, will cause significant new losses of national independence, and further imperil the rights and freedoms of the British people, by surrendering powers to the European Union:
  - a) to enter into international treaties binding on the United Kingdom, without the consent of your Government;
  - b) to ban political parties, deny free association and restrict the free expression of political opinion;
  - c) which can be used to introduce an alien system of criminal justice, abolish the ancient British rights of habeas corpus and trial by jury, and allow onto British soil men-at-arms from other countries with powers of enforcement;
  - d) to create a military force which will place British service personnel under the command of the European Union without reference to British interests, and contrary to:
    - i) the oath of personal loyalty to the Crown sworn by British forces;
    - ii) the Queen's Commission, and;
    - iii) the United Kingdom's obligations to the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation;
  - e) which remove the United Kingdom's right to veto decisions not in British interests;
3. The creation by the European Union of a Charter of Fundamental Rights, which purports to give it the power to abolish such "rights" at will;

4. The unlawful use of the Royal Prerogative to;
  - a) suspend or offend against statutes in ways which are prejudicial and detrimental to your sovereignty, contrary to the Coronation Oath Act, 1688;
  - b) subvert the rights and liberties of your loyal subjects, contrary to the ruling in *Nichols v Nichols*, 1576;

5. Your Majesty's power to withhold the Royal Assent, and the precedent set by Queen Anne under a similar threat to the security of the Realm in 1707;

WHEREFORE it is our humble duty TO PETITION Your Majesty to withhold the Royal Assent from any Parliamentary Bill which attempts to ratify the Treaty of Nice unless and until the people of the United Kingdom have given clear and specific approval to uphold and preserve the rights, freedoms and customs of your loyal subjects as set out in Magna Carta and the Declaration of Rights, which you, our Sovereign, swore before the nation to uphold and preserve in your Coronation Oath of June 1953.

We have the honour to be Your Majesty's loyal and obedient subjects.

(signed)

**Notes:**

The House of Lords Records Office confirmed in writing as recently as last September that Magna Carta, signed by King John in June 1215, stands to this day. Home Secretary Jack Straws said as much on 1 October 2000, when the Human Rights Act came into force. Halsbury's Laws of England says: "Magna Carta is as binding upon the Crown today as it was the day it was sealed at Runnymede."

The Treaty of Nice signed by the British Government in December 2000 includes:

Article 24 –transforms the EU into an independent state with powers to enter into treaties with other states which would then be binding on all member states, subject to agreement determined by Qualified Majority Voting.

Article 23 allows the EU to appoint its own representatives in other countries, effectively with ambassadorial status.

Article 191 –assumes for the EU the right to "lay down regulations governing political parties at European level [ie: in the EU]" and withdraw or prevent the funding of political parties which do not "contribute to forming a European awareness." This is a clear restriction of free speech and free political association. It also introduces two particularly abhorrent propositions – taxation without representation and the use of sanctions to suppress public opinion.

Articles 29 and 31 – establish common policing and judicial cooperation (Eurojust).

Article 67 allows matters of justice and home affairs to be agreed by QMV. These articles open the door to the imposition of *Corpus Juris* on the UK (article 31 specifically calls for cross-border policing and prosecution, and the removal of conflicts of jurisdiction), and the deployment of armed Europol law enforcement officers on the streets of Britain.

These matters were originally dealt with under article 280, which mysteriously disappeared from the draft of the Nice Treaty at the very last minute, in part at least following heavy pressure from British euro-realists.

Article 17 –establishes a common foreign and defence policy for the EU, with its own military force. The House of Commons was told on 11 December 2000, that: "The entire chain of command must remain under the political control and strategic direction of the EU. NATO will be kept informed." Her Majesty The Queen is Commander in Chief of all her armed forces and Colonel in Chief of 46 of Her Regiments of the British army, every other regiment owing its loyalty directly via another member of The Royal Family as its Colonel in Chief to Her Majesty.

The loss of the UK veto applies to 39 new areas of EU "competence", including indirect taxation, the environment, immigration, trade, employment, industrial policy, and regional funding. The EU also has plans for QMV to be expended to other areas not agreed at Nice, and without further treaty negotiations.

Charter of Fundamental Rights – signed at Biarritz, autumn 2000.

Article 52 purports to give the EU the power to abolish them at will, effectively making them meaningless. The whole proposition that the state has the right to grant and abolish fundamental human rights [ie: those we inherit at birth and hold in trust for future generations] is not only absurd but also contrary to Magna Carta, 1215, the Declaration of

Rights, 1688, and the Bill of Rights 1689.

Clause 61 of Magna Carta was last invoked when the Bishop of Salisbury (Gilbert Burnet) acted on behalf of the barons and bishops of England to invite William of Orange and Mary to come to London in 1688, after King James II had failed to re-establish Roman Catholicism in England, and lost the confidence of the people. His act of abdication was to throw the Great Seal into the Thames and flee the country.

The ruling in *Nichols v Nichols* 1576 included the words: “ Prerogative is created for the benefit of the people and cannot be exercised to their prejudice.” (The Royal Prerogative is the power delegated by the sovereign to ministers to sign treaties on behalf of the nation.)

In 1707, Queen Anne withheld the Royal Assent from the Scottish Militia Bill when it became apparent that James Francis Stuart (pretender Prince of Wales, and the Queen’s half-brother) was planning with Louis XIV of France to invade Scotland from Calais in an attempt to establish a Jacobite sovereign. Were such an invasion to be successful, the Queen feared a Scottish militia might be turned against the monarchy. Thus, parliament’s will was denied in the interests of the sovereignty of the nation and the security of the realm.

Addressing both Houses of Parliament on 20 July 1988, at an historic meeting of both houses to mark the 300th anniversary of the Declaration of Rights, Her Majesty said that it was “still part of statute law...on which the whole foundation and edifice of our parliamentary democracy rests.”

The Declaration of Rights spelt out the details:

“...the said Lords...and Commons, being the two Houses of Parliament, should continue to sit and...make effectual provision for the settlement of the ...laws and liberties of this kingdom, so that the same for the future might not be in danger again of being subverted. ...the particulars aforesaid shall be firmly and strictly holden and observed...and all officers and ministers whatsoever shall serve their Majesties and their successors according to the same, in all time to come.”

Both Magna Carta and the Declaration of Rights are contracts between the sovereign and the people. Because they are not statute law they cannot be repealed. Both proclaimed what were taken to be self-evident freedoms which exist by right. Equally, both were based on a concept of permanence.

List Of Signatories Peers signing the petition:

Lord Ashbourne, The Duke of Rutland, Viscount Massereene & Ferrard (as Lord Oriel), Lord Hamilton of Dalzell signed and presented the petition at Buckingham Palace.

The petition was also signed by:

Lord Sudeley, Viscount Cowdray, Viscount Norwich, Lord Napier & Ettrick, Earl of Romney,

Earl Kitchener, Lord Napier of Magdala, Lord Ailsa, Lord Sandys, Earl Cathcart, Lord Oaksey, Lord Milne, Lord Newall, Lord Barber of Tewkesbury, Lord Dormer, Viscount Exmouth, Lord Wise, Earl of Devon, Earl of Cromer, Earl of Shannon (as Lord Carleton), Lord Sandford, Marquis of Aberdeen (as Earl Aberdeen), Lord Strathcarron, Lord Craigmyle. The Countess of Dysart also signed, but the Dysart title is Scottish and pre-dates the Union of 1707.

Letter To The Queens Private Secretary

Sir Robin Janvrin, KCVO, CB Principal Private Secretary to Her Majesty The Queen  
Buckingham Palace London

23 March 2001.

You were kind enough to invite a letter of amplification to accompany our petition to Her Majesty. Thank you.

The Treaty of Nice raises issues of major constitutional importance. It directly threatens our rights and freedoms, and undermines oaths of loyalty to the Crown. Such fundamental matters cannot be considered merely the stuff of day-to-day politics. They directly concern the Crown, the constitution and every British subject, including generations yet unborn.

We find ourselves living in exceptional times, which call for exceptional measures.

Hence our petition to Her Majesty, which exercises rights unused for over 300 years –

clause 61 of Magna Carta, which were reinforced by article 5 of the Bill of Rights. As you know, the wording of clause 61 says: ...and, laying the transgression before us, petition to have that transgression redressed without delay... And we shall procure nothing from anyone, directly or indirectly, whereby any part of these concessions and liberties might be revoked or diminished; and if any such things has been procured, let it be void and null.

We have petitioned Her Majesty to withhold the Royal Assent from any Bill seeking to ratify the Treaty of Nice because there is clear evidence (which we shall address in a moment) that it is in direct conflict with the Constitution of the United Kingdom. It conflicts with Magna Carta, with the Declaration and Bill of Rights and, above all, with Her Majesty's Coronation Oath and the Oaths of Office of Her Majesty's ministers. Every one of these protections stand to this day, which is why they are now being invoked by our petition.

Ultimately, our supreme protection is Her Majesty's obligations under the Coronation Oath. The Queen has solemnly promised to govern the peoples of the United Kingdom according to the Statutes in Parliament agreed on and according to their laws and customs. Her Majesty also swore to preserve all rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain to any of them.

From the spiritual point of view, it is unimaginable that Her Majesty would seek, in effect, a divorce from her duty. From a secular point of view, the Coronation Oath is a signed contract.

Recent statements by ministers, and by the previous prime minister, confirm that they would not advise any measure which might tend to breach the Coronation Oath nor betray Her Majesty's promise to her loyal subjects. Her Majesty accepts the advice of her ministers. Conversely, it is their duty to advise in accordance with the Coronation Oath. They cannot lawfully advise a breach. Nor can they gain or remain in power without swearing allegiance to the Crown. Yet the Treaty of Nice represents precisely such a breach, and it has now been signed by the foreign secretary using the Royal Prerogative. Blackstones Commentaries (volume 1, page 239) says of the Royal Prerogative: The splendour, rights, and powers of the Crown were attached to it for the benefit of the people. They form part of, and are, generally speaking, as ancient as the law itself .De prerogativa regis is merely declaratory of the common law...

The duties arising from the relation of sovereign and subject are reciprocal. Protection, that is, the security and governance of his dominions according to law, is the duty of the sovereign; and allegiance and subjection, with reference to the same criterion, the constitution and laws of the country, form, in return, the duty of the governed We have already observed that the prerogatives are vested in him for the benefit of his subjects, and that his Majesty is under, and not above, the laws.

For such words to have meaning, the act of signing the Treaty of Nice by the foreign secretary demonstrates that ministers have de facto renounced their oaths of allegiance. Indeed, faced in due course with a Bill seek in gratification of the Treaty of Nice, the only options appear to be for Her Majesty to dissolve Parliament, or for the government to resign and fight an election on the issue.

The ex-government would then be faced with seeking elective power to introduce new oaths of loyalty under a new constitution as part of their new manifesto. This would distil the issues as perhaps nothing else might, since it would allow the people of the United Kingdom to decide whether or not they wished the constitution to be breached in this way, their rights and freedoms to be curtailed, and the position, powers and responsibilities of their sovereign to be diminished.

Of course, for the many thousands of subjects who have supported our petition, no such option exists. As the Act of Supremacy and the Bill of Rights put it: all usurped and foreign power and authority may forever be clearly extinguished, and never used or obeyed in this realm. no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate shall at any time after the last day of this session of Parliament, use, enjoy or exercise any manner of power, jurisdiction, superiority, authority, pre-eminence or privilege within this realm, but that henceforth the same shall be clearly abolished out of this realm, forever.



So it is clear that no-one – neither sovereign, nor parliament, nor government, nor people – may tamper with, dismantle, destroy or surrender our constitution. We are all tenants of it, and trustees. We inherited these rights, and we have a supreme responsibility to pass them in good order to future generations. They are not ours to discard or diminish.

Which is why oaths of allegiance place an essential limitation on parliament's power, and the Queens Coronation Oath is crucial. The Coronation Oath is a moral obligation, a religious obligation, a sworn obligation, a contractual obligation, a statutory obligation, a common law obligation, a customary obligation, an obligation on all who swear allegiance, it is the duty of government, and it is sworn for the nation, the commonwealth and all dominions.

The Coronation Oath is the peak of a pyramid, and all subordinate oaths are bound by its limitations. The armed services swear allegiance to the sovereign, not to the government of the day. This helps clarify the principle that allegiance is necessary, and not optional – an essential part of the checks and balances of our constitution. Without these oaths, and their lawful enforcement, we have little to protect us from government by tyranny.

We return now to our reasons for stating that the Treaty of Nice is unconstitutional. Our petition highlights several such clauses. We draw particular attention to article 191, which seeks to restrict the political freedom of Her Majesty's subject.

The EU seeks to assume the right to lay down regulations governing political parties at European level [ie: in the EU] and withdraw or prevent the funding of political parties which do not contribute to forming a European awareness. This is a clear restriction of free speech and free political association. It also introduces two particularly abhorrent propositions – taxation without representation and the use of state sanctions to suppress public opinion.

Our political freedom is absolute. The Bill of Rights says so. It cannot be limited in any way. Her Majesty is rightfully inscribed on our coins of the realm as Fid. Def. and Lib.Def. – Libertatis Defensor, Defender of the Freedom of the People.

It has been suggested to us that a referendum or plebiscite might be an acceptable response to the question of ratification of the Treaty of Nice, but we do not hold that view. A referendum or plebiscite which purported to make lawful the infringement of our common law rights would itself be unlawful.

We come back to the oath of allegiance. Magna Carta says: We will appoint as justices, constables, sheriffs, or other officials, only men that know the law of the realm and are minded to keep it well. . . . How can such officers of the Crown organize such a referendum or plebiscite?

These procedures would also infringe articles 1, 2 and 4 of the Bill of Rights:

1. That the pretended power of Suspending of Lawes or the Execution of Lawes by Regall Authority without Consent of Parlyament is illegall. (This must include the Coronation Oath Act.)
2. That the pretended Power of Dispensing with Lawes or the Execution of Lawes by Regal Authoritie as it hath beene assumed and exercised of late is illegall.
4. That levying Money for or to the Use of the Crowne by pretence of Prerogative without Grant of Parlyament for longer time or in other manner than the same is or shall be granted is Illegall (This is further protection of our common law rights).

In the event that the Treaty of Nice is considered for Royal Assent we respectfully request that Her Majesty grant us an opportunity to examine the opinion of those who seek to alter our constitution by contrary advice. Accordingly, under those same terms of Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights quoted earlier, we the undersigned, and others– have formed a Barons Constitutional Committee to be available for consultation and to monitor the present situation as it develops..until redress has been obtained.

We are and remain Her Majesty's most loyal and obedient subjects.

Ashbourne Rutland Massereene & Ferrard Hamilton of Dalzell

The Reply

“I am commanded by The Queen to reply to your letter of 23rd March and the accompanying petition to Her Majesty about the Treaty of Nice.

“The Queen continues to give this issue her closest attention. She is well aware of the

strength of feeling which European Treaties, such as the Treaty of Nice, cause. As a constitutional sovereign, Her Majesty is advised by her Government who support this Treaty. As I am sure you know, the Treaty of Nice cannot enter force until it has been ratified by all Member States and in the United Kingdom this entails the necessary legislation being passed by Parliament.”

EXHIBIT C.

Article 61 the whole text;

"61. Since, move-over, for God and the amendment of our kingdom and for the better allaying of the quarrel that has arisen between us and our barons, we have granted all these concessions, desirous that they should enjoy them in complete and firm endurance forever, we give and grant to them the underwritten security, namely, that the barons choose five and twenty barons of the kingdom, whomsoever they will, who shall be bound with all their might, to observe and hold, and cause to be observed, the peace and liberties we have granted and confirmed to them by this our present Charter, so that if we, or our justiciar, or our bailiffs or any one of our officers, shall in anything be at fault towards anyone, or shall have broken any one of the articles of this peace or of this security, and the offense be notified to four barons of the foresaid five and twenty, the said four barons shall repair to us (or our justiciar, if we are out of the realm) and, laying the transgression before us, petition to have that transgression redressed without delay.

And if we shall not have corrected the transgression (or, in the event of our being out of the realm, if our justiciar shall not have corrected it) within forty days, reckoning from the time it has been intimated to us (or to our justiciar, if we should be out of the realm), the four barons aforesaid shall refer that matter to the rest of the five and twenty barons, **and those five and twenty barons shall, together with the community of the whole realm, distrain and distress us in all possible ways, namely, by seizing our castles, lands, possessions, and in any other way they can, until redress has been obtained as they deem fit, saving harmless our own person, and the persons of our queen and children**; and when redress has been obtained, they shall resume their old relations towards us.

And let whoever in the country desires it, swear to obey the orders of the said five and twenty barons for the execution of all the aforesaid matters, and along with them, to molest us to the utmost of his power; and we publicly and freely grant leave to everyone who wishes to swear, and we shall never forbid anyone to swear. All those, moreover, in the land who of themselves and of their own accord are unwilling to swear to the twenty five to help them in constraining and molesting us, we shall by our command compel the same to swear to the effect foresaid.

And if any one of the five and twenty barons shall have died or departed from the land, or be incapacitated in any other manner which would prevent the foresaid provisions being carried out, those of the said twenty five barons who are left shall choose another in his place according to their own judgment, and he shall be sworn in the same way as the others. Further, in all matters, the execution of which is entrusted, to these twenty five barons, if perchance these twenty five are present and disagree about anything, or if some of them, after being summoned, are unwilling or unable to be present, that which the majority of those present ordain or command shall be held as fixed and established, exactly as if the whole twenty five had concurred in this; and the said twenty five shall swear that they will faithfully observe all that is aforesaid, and cause it to be observed with all their might. And we shall procure nothing from anyone, directly or indirectly, whereby any part of these concessions and liberties might be revoked or diminished; and if any such things has been procured, let it be void and null, and we shall never use it personally or by another."

-----  
[We received no further communication from either agent and, after the time frame for a reply had elapsed we served the final Notice of default on Mrs Graham];

To: Mrs C Graham (doing business as an officer of revenue and customs for HMRC).

HMRC DMB 380  
BX5 5AB  
From: Sandra Wicks xxxxxxx xxxxxxxx, xx xxxx xxxxx  
Glastonbury.  
Somerset.  
BA6  
Tax ref: xxxxx xxxxx

Date Notice served: 30th Nov 2015.  
Sent by recorded post.

**NOTICE OF DEFAULT**

Notice to Agent is Notice to Principle.  
Dear Mrs C Graham,

You have failed to respond to the two (2) previous Notices that I served on you, which is now taken to mean that you and all interested parties agree entirely with the points of law that I previously stated and, that HMRC has no claim against I, Sandra Wicks since you have provided your tacit consent to said Notices.

I provide you with a further seven (7) days from receiving this 'Notice of Default' to respond to the Notice of Conditional acceptance in substance and in full.

You are in dishonour at this time as you have a duty to respond to the very serious constitutional points that I refer to within said Notices. Any further action taken by HMRC against I, Sandra Wicks, whilst my lawful points remain un-rebutted without substance, shall be agreed to be harassment by all interested parties and a counter claim may ensue against you personally Mrs C Graham. Any reply must be made on your full commercial liability and on penalty of perjury.

Sincerely, without any admission of liability whatsoever and, with no attempt to deceive or to be vexatious and, with all my inalienable Constitutional rights reserved. On my full commercial liability and penalty of perjury.

Signed: Sandra Wicks.

Witnessed by: Date:

1.----- 2.-----  
----- 3.-----  
-----

-----  
[We later received two conflicting correspondences from HMRC.  
The first dated the 17th December 2015];  
HM Revenue & Customs.  
Debt Management  
C Graham  
Northgate House  
Agard street  
Derby  
DE1 1RU  
Date 17 Decemberr 2015

Our Ref XXXXX XXXXXXXXXXX

NI Number xxxxxxxxx  
Dear Mrs Wicks,

Thank you for your letter dated 30 November 2015 regarding your outstanding Self Assessment debt £1252.65  
I have checked your self assessment record and we have not received your 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 income tax returns. Therefore because we have not received them you have occurred penalties.  
Your 2014/2015 Self Assessment Tax Return and payment are due by the 31 January

2016.

To avoid penalties occurring please ensure HMRC receive them on time.

If you have stopped being Self Employed could you please tell us the date you ceased?

If you have any problems with filing on line your outstanding Self assessment Tax Returns please telephone the Online Service helpline on [0300 200 3600](tel:03002003600) and for any other Self Assessment problems contact our Self Assessment Helpline on [0300 200 3310](tel:03002003310).

GO PAPERLESS If you are Self Employed with no other source of income, no employees and are not registered for VAT you can choose to receive messages through your on line account. To do this, go to [www.online.gov.uk/login](http://www.online.gov.uk/login) and login to your account then select the option to go paperless. If you do not have an online account for Self Assessment already, go to [www. bla bla bla...](http://www.bla-bla-bla...)to set one up.

Please remember that the deadline for your 2015 Self Assessment Tax Return online is 31 January 2016, If you haven't yet registered for online filing, please allow at least seven working days to complete the registration process.

Yours sincerely  
(unsigned).

-----  
[The second letter was dated 22 December is as follows];

HM Revenue & Customs.

HM Revenue and Customs

PAYE & Self Assessment Complaints

BX9 1AS

Tel [03000 581483](tel:03000581483)

Mrs Sandra Wicks xxxxx

Glastonbury

BA6 XXX

22 December 2015.

Complaints id; xxxxxx

NI Number; xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Thank you for your letter of 16 November.

I am sorry for any concern we have caused but, frankly, I do not believe that the powers you seek to invoke override the specific statute under which we have sought the penalties we raised.

**Even so, on the basis that your circumstances have not changed since you submitted your last tax return, for 2011/2012, I will cancel the penalties and repay the funds you recently used to settle some of them.**

If you feel I have not dealt with your complaint fully or correctly, you may ask for a further review by a different complaint handler by writing to;

HM Revenue & Customs. PAYE & Self Assessment Complaints BA6 1AS

Please make both your letter and envelope 'For the attention of the Operational manager (Customer Complaints) PAYE & SA - Complaint further review'. If you require more information about making a complaint, you will find it on our website at;

[www....bla bla blab](http://www....bla-bla-blab)

If you do not have access to the internet but would like a copy of our factsheet, please contact me on the number shown at the top of this letter.

Your sincerely

Sugnature)

Steve Jones Complaints Officer.

-----  
So there you have it. An admission that they were wrong to fine her but no admission to the evidenced facts provided.

As Sandi rightly states "how do they know my circumstances haven't changed?" She hasn't dealt with them for a number of years except to pay up under duress and protest. They may wriggle and squirm around the truth but the result is clear. They will not admit that they are compounding treason obviously, but they are unwilling to commit high treason to attempt to enforce their thefts upon us either. They don't really care about money its all fictional anyway, they wish to maintain the illusion as a control mechanism for fear and servility, yet it is they that are in fear of us NOT the other way around. I hope this latest victory will inspire YOU to act according to our constitutional law and to dissent in a peaceful but powerful manner. Sandi is now NOT supporting paedophilia, terrorism, war crimes etc etc etc... she may not still be happy with the world but at least she is no longer assisting in her own demise and that of her loved ones. Well done Sandi!!!