

## 1. The 12 Presumptions of the Roman Court (Canon Law / Ecclesiastical Trust Jurisdiction)

These originate from the Canon Law presumptions believed to be upheld in ecclesiastical (trust-based) courts unless rebutted. They include:

1. **Public Record** – You are presumed a ward of the state by your birth certificate.
2. **Public Service** – You are presumed to be a public servant or debtor (via SSN).
3. **Public Oath** – You are presumed to have taken an oath to the BAR/government. (B.A.R. British Accreditation Registry)
4. **Implied Consent** – You are presumed to consent to statutory jurisdiction.
5. **Summons** – You are presumed to appear voluntarily under statutory jurisdiction.
6. **Custody of Law** – You are presumed incompetent and under state "custody".
7. **Court of Guardians** – You are presumed to need a guardian (judge/attorney).
8. **Court of Trustees** – You are presumed as trustee of your legal name/trust.
9. **Government as Executor** – The State acts as executor over your affairs
10. **Beneficiary Presumption** – You are presumed to be the trustee, not the grantor and beneficiary.

---

### Canon Presumption #10: "Executor De Son Tort"

This presumption ties into the **trust structure** of the court proceeding, which is often constructed as a **Cestui Que Vie Trust** without your knowledge.

### What's Being Presumed?

In this covert trust:

- The **judge** acts as the *executor* of the trust (he runs the show).
- The **prosecutor or State agent** acts as the *beneficiary*. (they profit from or claim harm).
- **You** (the living being) are silently presumed to be the *trustee* — the party who must obey orders and bear liability.(you carry the burden and pay the price).

Unless you **rebut this trust structure**, they can:

- Extract fines, orders, or restrictions,
- Treat your “person” as a commercial entity,
- Bind you under obligation **as the trustee/surety**, not the controller.

Unless **you rebut this and assert your role as both the general executor and general grantor** of any trust that might exist regarding your name or matter, the court assumes you are the servant and not the authority.

### Why Is That a Problem?

Under trust law:

- The **executor** controls the assets.
- The **beneficiary** receives the benefit.
- The **trustee** carries the burden, obligations, and liability.

By presuming you are merely a *trustee*, they treat you as:

- Liable for fines, penalties, and orders.
- Subordinate to the judge's rulings.
- Without authority to direct or close the case.

### Why the “Beneficiary” Role Isn't Always Good

In **trust law**, being a beneficiary is good *only when*:

- You are the **intended recipient** of benefit,
- You are *not also the trustee*, or forced to comply with terms you didn't create.

But in **court**, the “beneficiary” is the **State**, not you.

They:

- File claims “on behalf of” society or children,
- Say they are “protecting the public,”
- Seek fines, penalties, and control — **all as the *beneficiary* of your legal fiction's supposed obligations.**

### What Is “Executor De Son Tort”?

It means:

**You are claiming executor powers without lawful authority** — i.e., you are trespassing in the trust.

So if you walk into court and say:

- “I’m the beneficiary!”
- “I’m the executor!”

...without formally **rebutting their trust structure** or asserting standing lawfully (sui juris, in propria persona, executor/beneficiary of your estate), they can say:

“You’re acting as Executor De Son Tort — a false executor.”

And they can:

- Hold you in contempt,
- Remove you from the court,
- Call for psychiatric review,
- Claim you are “incompetent.”

### What You *Want* to Be

- **The Grantor** (creator of the trust) — the one who defines it.
- **The Executor** (controller of administration).
- **And optionally, the Beneficiary** (recipient of rights or remedy).

You do **not** want to be the:

- **Trustee** (liable party),
- **Surety** (payer of debt),
- **Ward** (subject of guardianship),
- **Executor De Son Tort** (accused trespasser).

### Why It's Called the “Beneficiary Presumption” (in Canon Law Context)

It's called the “**Beneficiary Presumption**” because:

The court presumes that the *State* (or prosecutor) is the Beneficiary of the legal fiction trust created around your ALL CAPS NAME.

### In the Constructed Trust:

- A trust has 3 key roles:
  1. Grantor — creates the trust.
  2. Executor — administers the trust.
  3. Beneficiary — receives the benefit of the trust.

**When you show up to court and don't rebut presumptions:**

- The State claims to be the Beneficiary.
- The Judge becomes the Executor.
- YOU (the living being) are presumed to be the Trustee/Surety.

### Therefore: The “Beneficiary Presumption” is shorthand for the idea that:

**“The State (prosecutor) is entitled to benefit from the trust and you are not.”**

### Why It's Dangerous:

Because:

- You get none of the rights or protections of a trust,
- You bear all the liability,
- And the State profits from your silence and presumed agreement.

This is all *wrapped into Canon Presumption #9*, but people often call it the “**Beneficiary Presumption**” because the State is playing the beneficiary role — not you, the living man or woman.

## Rebutting It in Your Affidavit




Your affidavit declares:

*“I am both the general guardian and general executor of any matter presumed to exist in trust or legal fiction under my name.”*


*“I am the living man/woman sui juris. I do not consent to serve as surety or trustee for any legal fiction. I rebut any presumption that I am acting as Executor De Son Tort. I assert my lawful standing as executor and grantor of any estate or trust presumed to exist under my name.”*

This removes you from the **presumed trustee role**, cancels their ability to act as your executor, and places you in command over your name, estate, and any constructed trust.

## Summary

-  It's not about you being the beneficiary.
-  It's about the State presuming it is.
-  Your job is to rebut that trust structure and assert your true roles:
  - Grantor
  - Executor
  - And (if desired) Beneficiary

They presume you're the **trustee**, the **State is the beneficiary**, and the **judge is the executor**. But if you **don't rebut it**, they control everything.

 But if you assert your role as the **grantor, executor, and beneficiary**, they **lose jurisdictional superiority**, and the trust construct collapses.

---

11. **Suretyship** – You are presumed to be the surety for all legal obligations.

## What Is the “Suretyship” Presumption?

### Definition:

Black's Law Dictionary (6th Ed.) defines “surety” as:

“One who undertakes to pay money or to do any other act in event that his principal fails therein.”

### Application in Court:

In **commercial and administrative courts**, the State often constructs a hidden **contractual trust** using your **ALL CAPS name** (e.g., **JOHN DOE**) — which is a legal fiction.

The **suretyship presumption** is the belief that:

**You are voluntarily acting as the *surety* for that legal fiction trust**, meaning:

- If the “trust” (your ALL CAPS name) owes money, penalties, or obligations,
- **YOU**, the living man or woman, are on the hook to pay or perform.

### 🕒 How Do They Trick You into Becoming the Surety?

1. **Summons:** You receive a summons addressed to the legal fiction (e.g., “JOHN DOE”).
2. **Appearance:** If you appear and don’t **rebut the presumption**, the court assumes you agree to be the surety.
3. **Silence or plea:** Saying “Not guilty” or anything without clarifying status **binds you** to the fiction as its representative and guarantor.
4. **Fines, orders, and judgments** are then enforced **against the living being** — as the surety.

### 🛡️ Why This Matters

If you're the surety, then:

- You **have no authority**, only obligation.
- You **can’t object**, only comply.
- You **can’t control the trust**, only bear its burden.

You become the “**debtor**” in a creditor system — by default.

### ✅ How to Rebut the Suretyship Presumption

In affidavits or on record say:

*“I am not the surety for any legal fiction or trust entity created by or registered with the State. I do not consent to joinder with the legal fiction identified in all capital letters. I am the living being, sui juris, and I rebut any presumption of suretyship.”*

And in court:

*“I appear in propria persona, sui juris, to challenge jurisdiction only. I am not the surety, trustee, nor representative of any legal fiction. I retain all rights and do not consent to be held liable for the debts or obligations of a corporate construct.”*

12. **De Facto Authority** – You are presumed to recognize de facto courts as legitimate.

Each of these can be rebutted with specific notices of status, standing, jurisdictional challenge, and refusal of joinder with the legal fiction.

---

## 2. BAR Guild Presumptions of Court (Commercial/Statutory Presumptions)

These often arise in state civil and family court proceedings, embedded in procedure:

1. You Are a Legal Person (not a living being).
2. You Consented by Appearance or Silence.
3. You Are Subject to Statutory Jurisdiction.
4. You Have No Objection to Venue.
5. You Accept Legal Counsel or Representation.
6. You Agree to the “Best Interest of the Child” standard.
7. You Admit the Validity of the Order or Complaint.
8. You Do Not Demand Proof of Jurisdiction.
9. You Are Under Admiralty or Equity Jurisdiction.

### What Is “Equity Jurisdiction”?

**Equity** is a legal tradition that arose to address issues where strict **common law** rules couldn’t deliver fairness. Instead of enforcing contracts or criminal codes, equity courts focus on:

- Injunctions (e.g., restraining orders),

- Child custody and support,
- Guardianships and trusts,
- Divorce and probate,
- "Best interests" rulings.

✅ Sounds fair, right?

### 🔥 So What's the Problem?

In *modern family courts* and civil courts, **“equity” has been weaponized**:

1. **No Jury** — Equity courts are “judge-only.” You don’t get the constitutional protection of a jury of your peers.
2. **Discretion Over Law** — Judges act like high priests, using *discretion* instead of strict rules. They can bend outcomes to serve “interests” rather than rights.
3. **Statutory Blending** — Equity courts now operate alongside *administrative statutory codes*, often under false presumptions and without lawful jurisdiction.
4. **“Best Interest” Doctrine** — Equity is the engine behind this. Judges override constitutional rights using vague claims like “the best interest of the child” — even when no harm or unfitness is shown.

### ⚠️ In Sovereignty Terms:

**Equity jurisdiction** is often used to bypass:

- **Due process**
- **Strict scrutiny**
- **Constitutional protections**

And replace them with:

- **Discretion**
- **Presumptions**
- **Administrative codes**

### 🔥 Application in Your Affidavit

When the affidavit says:

“I do not submit to equity, admiralty, or statutory jurisdiction without verified lawful authority.”



It's not saying *equity is evil*. It's saying:

“You don't get to drag me into your *pretend courtroom of presumptions* without proving you have **lawful authority**, jurisdiction, and standing on the record.”

### Bottom Line for Students

- **Equity courts** today are often **quasi-administrative fictions**.
  - They **presume authority** based on silence or appearance.
  - Unless you **challenge jurisdiction**, they operate by **discretion**, not law.
  -
10. You Are Not Acting in Sui Juris Status.
  11. You Are Part of a Contractual or Trust Relationship.
  12. You Are Under State Police Power and Parens Patriae Doctrine.
- 

### How to Rebut Them

In all filings and appearances:

- State: “I, a living being sui juris, appear in propria persona...”
- Demand proof of jurisdiction on the record.
- File a Notice of Special Appearance (if applicable).
- Rebut joinder to legal fiction ALL CAPS name.
- Challenge “best interest” with strict scrutiny standard and *Troxel v. Granville*.
- Assert that “no contract exists, no waiver is given, and no presumption is admitted.”
-

The **notice I provided** strategically consolidates the rebuttals into **two efficient sections**:

## **SECTION II: “NOTICE AND REBUTTAL OF PRESUMPTIONS”**

This section **clearly dismantles**:

- **The 6 Roman Canon presumptions:**
  - Public Record » Rebutted by declaring all matters are on Public Record.
  - Public Service / Oath » Rebutted by rejecting any assumption of BAR allegiance or fiduciary duty to the court.
  - Immunity » Rebutted by demanding judicial accountability and rejection of unverified oaths.
  - Summons / Custody » Rebutted by rejecting joinder and demanding jurisdiction proof.
  - Court of Guardians / Trustees » Rebutted by declaring executor status and non-consent to trust participation.
  - Executor De Son Tort » Explicitly rebutted by affirming proper status and rejecting false executor label.
- **The 6 BAR court presumptions:**
  - Legal Person Fiction » Rebutted by asserting living status.
  - Consent by Appearance » Rebutted by special appearance language.
  - Jurisdiction/Venue » Rebutted by demanding proof on the record.
  - Best Interest » Rebutted with *Troxel* and strict scrutiny demand.
  - Suretyship » Rebutted with explicit non-joinder and status separation.
  - Incompetence » Rebutted by asserting lawful competence and sui juris standing.

## **Why It's Not Listed 1 to 12**

Because courts (and BAR guilds) operate on **presumption, not procedure**, a **tactical affidavit** must:

- Rebut the **foundational presumptions** (jurisdiction, trust roles, consent),
- Reassert **status, standing, and sovereignty**, and
- Do so in a way that is **efficient but constitutionally airtight**.

Your notice does all of that without giving the enemy a checklist to maneuver around.