

TURMEL: Nielsen Quash hearing report

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2005-01/0674.html>

From: John Turmel (*bc726_at_FreeNet.Carleton.CA*)

Date: 01/12/05

Date: 12 Jan 2005 01:42:03 GMT

>*Date:* Tue, 11 Jan 2005 19:32:51 -0500

>*From:* *sunshinesue_@hotmail.com* (*suzanne johnson*)

>*Subject:* *Outcome of today's proceedings!!!!!!!!!!*

>*To:* *MedPot-discuss@yahoogroups.com*

Hi all again, Suzanne here, I tried my best to deliver to you what was said on our tape. ENJOY ALL !!!!!!!

First, both motions were filed on time as per Judge L.Serre.

She asked, do we have the authority to serve this court with the contempt notice here in provincial court, or do you need to inform other people, meaning the Attorney General in Ottawa. We replied that we needed to confer with our advisors. So, we asked for half an hour recess and the Judge gave us 10 minutes.

We conferred with John and he said to put aside this motion and deal with the quash motion.

Upon return into the courtroom, the Judge felt that she couldn't deal with this motion of contempt because she didn't have the authority to do so because the Frankel case didn't happen in her courtroom.

So Richard replied, can we proceed with the quash motion now and she said YES!!!! HURRAY!!!!!!

(The battle has begun) she then said that we will deal with the tape recorder issue.

Aube stood up and objected saying the crown attorney has to pay for court transcripts everybody has to pay for this, what makes Mr. Johnson so special.

The Judge then read out loud section 136, which deals with tape recording in the court. Section 136 states that no tape

recordings are allowed except under certain circumstances. And at this point, richard interrupted the court by saying that John Turmel took a tape recorder to every court all the way to supreme court and was accepted, why shouldn't I be allowed? richard also mentioned earlier that he couldn't afford a stenographer so then the Judge ALLOWED the recorder. HURRAY!!!!

It appears that the Judge is on our side and very compassionate. At this point, Richard stood up and started:

OK, well, you honor, I'm here to show that section 7 was fought in the Alberta court of Appeals and the Supreme Court of Canada and the Ontario Court of Appeals. I have all the judgments here showing the orders being signed saying that there's no force, no effect for marihuana laws.

Have you heard of Krieger before you heard of me? At this point, the Judge said that she is not answering questions..

Richard replies, ok, then, your honor, my motion is to prove a cover up from Mr. Frankel, at the top, he misrepresented himself to the Calgary Herald and Calgary sun. He knew that the law was struck down, he let the crown prosecutors all across Canada continue to have people arrested, or to let the police know, he didn't let the crowns know, he didn't let me know or you know, that these laws are dead!!!

It's all in my motion, if you read the motion, it's pretty self-explanatory. I'm not a lawyer, but, everything is here. I know, I went to school, supreme court says, we're all taught in this country, it goes to the Supreme Court, that's the top, it can't come back down to another court.

Hitzig, OK, which they're trying to use against me, Hitzig, first of all, was an opinion, second of all, Hitzig dealt with section 4, I'm dealing with section 7. Krieger says that section 7 is alive!! Why did I get arrested? I want to deal with section 7. show me where section 7 is against the law? I didn't do nothing against the law! that's what I'm saying for my motion. I should have all my charges quashed, my wife and daughter has been arrested to be used against me to try and cop a plea. I don't know how that ever happened in this country, but it happened!

Something is not right. They arrested me illegally, it's all here, you've been lied to, I've been lied to, why didn't the Canadian public know? Why weren't we lead to be known that there was no laws? Why was it misrepresented to the 2 newspapers, which are in there, if you read them. Everybody at the top knew who was involved in those cases. Why didn't

somebody make it publicly known that the newspapers were misrepresented, that Krieger case wasn't a personal win, as they're trying to say it was. this was a win for ALL of canada. the law is the law!

the Crown has gone to the Supreme Court to try and appeal the Court decision in Krieger. 6 of 9 Judges said NO, WE'RE NOT GOING TO APPEAL IT!!! we're dismissing your case. Making the Court of Appeals laws, the standing law in town. that's the law that I'm going to respect!

That's the law that I'm going to respond to, That's not a law that I should have been arrested. There was no law at the time. And I want my charges quashed! I want my stuff back!! That's my case!!! Right there!!!!!! there was no law! It was struck down!! Section 7. Section 4 has nothing to do with me. Hitzig has nothing to do with me. That was a resurrection of section 4, not section 7 your honor.

Your Honor replies: So, by the letter of the law, your saying that section 7 has been struck down?

Richard replies: That's right, and I've been arrested, my life has been turned up-side down costs me money, costs my children to resent the police and the whole town for this, it's just not a good thing, why weren't we told, why wasn't the Canadian public told that there is no law, why does the police still have the power to arrest people and arrest me!

Why isn't the truth being told to the public, why has there been a media ban for 2 years. THIS ALL AFFECTS MY CASE!!! If they would have told me and let me know, Mr. Aube wouldn't be sitting right here, we wouldn't be wasting your time, the courts time, the taxpayers money!!! We are here for a law that is unknown. Why am I charged. How can I be charged with an unknown law? It doesn't make no sense!!!

Supreme Court of Canada agrees with the court of Appeals, WHAT'S THE PROBLEM!! Hitzig is trying to resurrect number 4, IT WAS AN OPINION!!!

Show me an order where it shows Hitzig actually signing the order stating it was no more than an opinion, there is no such order, as far as I know.

There's nothing here to arrest me for! I've done nothing wrong!! And if section 7 doesn't apply the section 4 doesn't apply. I would just like to point out that in the Phillips case in Windsor, Jan. 2nd, 2003, it was ruled prohibition was repealed. Why are some judges repealing, some judges are dismissing, some judges are convicting, because the law is

so muddled.

If the laws weren't so muddled, if the crown attorney of Canada, the big guy, if he came clean and tell everybody what's going on, the arrests would stop. All the people that have been arrested for the last 2 or 3 years, they shouldn't be in jail. They shouldn't have had convictions because it was unknown to law.

I don't understand what the big deal is? If it's unknown to law, stop this madness, let me get on with my life, let government legislate, the cat I did anything wrong!

I'm looking at the highest decisions in the land, a lower court can't say to hell with the higher courts, that's not right! That's not the way it's done! We have a constitution to protect us! what is this country coming to if that's not respected. Your Honor, you have the power, OK, to make this respectable again, make our country respectable again, expose the truth to the public. Have my charges quashed. That's my case.

At this point Your Honor proceeded to say something and Richard interrupts:

Richard says: If nothing else, even the repealed letter Health Canada reinstates the repealed sections that made the law unconstitutional to begin within Terry Parker case. They put back 2 of 5 things that they've taken out, they put it back in, making the law unconstitutional again.

So, even if you want to use the Hitzig against me, Health Canada made it unconstitutional again by putting these 2 cancers back in. I have here, the actual submission from the case -- Aids Canada asking them to put them back in, it's not fair, people are dying, they can't get medicine, it's unconstitutional again as well as when I got arrested.

so not only is the issue unknown to law, OK, but we also have Health Canada putting in the 2 out of 5 which made this unconstitutional. So, that's my point, if you don't want to respect the 1st point, and I'm not trying to be disrespectful by the way I'm talking, I'm just excited. But, come on, this is just wrong in every which way you can look at it.

Judge asks: How does case Dec. 23/2003 tie in with your case?

Richard replies: OK, your Honor, like I said the Crown, Mr Frankel knew that section 7 has been struck down, he tried to go to the supreme Court to have it appealed, they said

NO. Because it had already been dealt with and we agree with the Courts of Appeal in Alberta. I don't understand what's the confusion?

At this point, Richard sits down. And it's Mr Aube's turn. At this time I'm having a hard time understanding was mumbo jumbo he's trying to say on the tape, so I will deliver his side at a later date, when we decipher his part! sorry, I hope I made this legible!

After Aube's finished, the end result was a return date by Judge L. Serre. (on Jan 18) where at that time she will render her decision on the motion! HURRAY!!!

Richard did a wonderful job, I thought. He talked just as professional as any lawyer I've seen in court, you would've all been proud. As nervous as he was, I was confident that he made our interest known very loudly, haha, and we will have our ruling on January 18th, at 10 in the morning! I sure hope this all helps you John and us, lol!!
Nite All Have a great day

JCT: Looking good. If the judge does her homework, I just don't see how she can disobey the Supreme Court order.

--

Abolitionist Slave Leader John C. "The Banking Systems Engineer" Turmel for UNILETS interest-free time-based currency in U.N. resolution C6 to Governments in the <http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration.htm>
<http://www.cyberclass.net/turmel> 519-753-0645 USENET: can.politics