**SPEEDING TICKETS**

All traffic related tickets, including speeding tickets, only apply to cars that are ***registered***.

By ***registering*** your car you have ***given up*** ownership and handed the ***controlling title*** to a ***corporation***, such as DVLA or DMV, which operate as a ***trust***, making you the ***trustee***.

You are no longer the owner of the car, but have accepted the title ***“registered keeper”***.

This action of ***registering*** has now placed you within a ***“pseudo-contract”*** or ***jurisdiction*** of a ***corporation*** and, as ***trustee,*** you are now bound by all the ***corporate policies***.

These corporate polices apply to the ***government property*** you are driving, which is now titled a ***“vehicle”***, and you have accepted the ***legal title*** of ***“driver”*** within ***commerce***, which requires a ***licence***.

Note: Licence means ***“asking permission to use”***.

As you are now operating within the jurisdiction of the DVLA or DMV, all ***“state-speed limits”*** now apply to you. This includes all traffic policies such as yellow lines, congestion charge and ULEZ.

Note: there are ***no*** road laws. And there is no such thing as a ***lawful*** parking ticket or speed limit.

Because you have accepted the ***corporate polices*** of the DVLA or DMV, you have agreed to follow ***“state-speed limits”*** and also agreed to report who the ***driver*** is of the ***vehicle*** when requested.

Within the ***United Kingdom Corporation*** this is done through the following act.

**Road Traffic Act 1988, Section 172, Paragraph (2), Section (a)**

(2) Where the driver of a vehicle is alleged to be guilty of an offence to which this section applies—

(a) the person keeping the vehicle shall give such information as to the identity of the driver as he may be required to give by or on behalf of a chief officer of police.

However, you have ***not*** agreed, nor are you obligated to pay any fine to any third party corporation.

The language used details what is required:

1. ***“Person keeping the vehicle”***; this is the ***registered keeper***.
2. ***“Identity of the driver”***; this refers to the ***name*** of the driver.

However, the ***“name”*** is yours to determine. But the police want you to fill out their form, which asks for ***“surname”*** ***not*** just ***“name”.*** This ***surname*** refers to the ***debtor’s name***, making that person liable for the ***debt*** created by the ticket.

The police are just a ***private corporation*** and are trying to get you to enter into a contract.

This practice is called ***legal entrapment in commerce.*** However, it is ***not*** considered fraud at this time unless you dispute the paperwork, in which case it may be treated as such.

Note: all speed limits and speed detection devices, such as cameras, are ***privately owned*** and do not apply to you, unless you have accepted the ***“contract”*** by ***registering*** your car and thereby allowing the government to own it.

The police are ***corporate policy enforcers*** and operate independently of the DVLA and have no authority ***without contract***.

When your vehicle, with its ***licence plate***, is photographed or recorded on a ***privately-owned*** speed camera, the ***“for-profit, privately-owned company”*** called the police, will contact you to initiate a contract.

First, they will ask for the name of the ***driver***, as you have agreed to give this information, and then the police will ask if you would like to pay them for breaking a ***policy*** of the ***DVLA Corporation***.

This deception is carried out by filling out the ***form*** that the police send you, and if you complete the form, you are now obligated to pay the police the ***“fine”***.

Note: there is no law saying you are obligated to fill out ***any*** corporate form; if you are pressured into filling out a corporate form, place the burden of proof on them to provide the evidence needed for you to comply.

If you send your ***own paperwork***, stating who the driver was at the time, you have fulfilled your obligation to the DVLA.

You have ***not*** agreed to pay the police, and as you have complied with DVLA policy, there is nothing further the police can do.

It should be noted that if you choose this remedy, there have been alleged reports where certain police departments have been forging signatures and forcing their paperwork through the court system, without the knowledge of the ***registered keeper***.

When most ***“speeding fines”*** are sent out by the police, they are ***not*** signed and ***no proof*** will be supplied.

**Note:** you are guilty at this point and you have to prove you are ***not*** guilty.

However, you have the right to reply to the police stating the ***deficiencies and irregularities*** in their correspondence and requiring them to provide the following:

1. The name of the one making the claim; duly signed.
2. Proof of the claim.
3. Obligation to deal with the police, in the form of a contract.

Within commerce, all correspondence and especially written notices must be replied to, otherwise ***due process*** has ***not*** been carried out.

Nevertheless, it has been alleged in reports that the police are now ignoring notices and fraudulently forcing fake paperwork through the courts in order for them to get paid.

If this is the case, and if your paperwork is sound, then you have the right to sue the police for damages.

**Police Response**

If you choose to use your own paperwork in reply to any traffic ticket and get a response, you have the right to request the police to ***evidence*** any claim or statement they make, such as:

**Statement:** ***“You are required to complete the form enclosed.”***

**Response:** ***“You are hereby given 30 days to provide the obligation that substantiates your claim that I am required to complete your form.”***

**Statement:** ***“You have not carried out your legal requirements.”***

**Response:** ***“You are hereby given 30 days to provide said legal requirements along with written proof of my obligation to carry them out.”***

**Statement:** ***“You have not signed our form.”***

**Response:** ***“You are hereby given 30 days to provide the proclaimed legislation that compels me to sign your form.”***

If you have provided the driver’s name using your own paperwork, enclosed in your own envelope, which has been sent recorded delivery, and subsequently you receive the following response:

***“Your correspondence does not provide the information required from you as the registered keeper/nominated person, in order to identify the driver under section 172 of the Road Traffic Act 1988.”***

You have the right to request the police provide ***evidence*** of this claim, which they cannot, as you have already ***complied*** with said act using your own paperwork, which you are entitled to do.

What the police are trying to do here is to coerce you into completing the same information you have already sent, but on ***their form***, which places you into contract with the police and therefore obligates you to pay them.

**Police Traps**

**Evidence**

When asking for proof of claim and evidence to support it, the police will often only supply you with a link to download alleged evidence.

This is another trap; as by using said link you will have entered into joinder, and are now obligated to pay.

Furthermore, as the ***“evidence”*** has come from a 3rd party source and ***not*** directly from the police in the form of written and signed documentation, the police are ***“not liable”*** for any mistakes because you decided to download the 3rd party information.

These links are based on the assumption that you accept them as evidence, placing the liability on you.

You must remember that you are ***not obligated*** to click on links and you can actively source any information or evidence in any way you choose.

Note: you can decline to use any link on the basis of cyber security issues and therefore you require the evidence to be sent to you in writing.

CD’s and USB sticks will not be accepted, unless the evidence is of a visual or audible nature, as requested by you.

It is the responsibility of the claimant, in this case the police, to provide evidence to substantiate their claim.

If the police fail to provide any evidence of their claim by the time it gets to court, you must notify the judge of this, who is then obligated to dismiss the case.

You must provide evidence to the court that you requested evidence at least ***three times*** by way of notice, which proves you tried to remedy the situation and it is the police who have ***failed*** to ***perform***.

**Options**

On various occasions you may be offered ***options*** to follow; however, if you accept any said options you have now contracted and are obligated to pay.

You must spot this fact; if options are being offered, then the claimant is ***assuming*** a contract already exists.

This is a typical trick used by debt collection agencies and fraudsters.

**Help lines**

In some instances a ***“helping hand”*** is offered with tickets and claims of fine or forfeiture. They state that if you are finding it difficult to pay the fine, then you can contact a certain agency for ***“help”***.

This again is a trap, as being a ***“helping hand”*** could not be further from the truth. If you accept this helping hand, you have accepted the obligation to pay, and the hand that offered to help will now be used to take everything from you.

**Police Jurisdiction**

You have the right to request which jurisdiction the police are operating under, and if they are obligated by the ***Bill of Rights Act 1689***.

This question will place the police in a position of weakness, because if they answer ***“no”***, then they have just exposed the ***fraud***, and if the answer ***“yes”***, then you can now use the Bill of Rights against them.

**Bill of Rights Act 1689**

On 21 July 1993, the Speaker of The House of Commons issued a reminder to the courts.

The Right Honourable Baroness Betty Boothroyd (1929-2023) said the following:

***“There has of course been no amendment to The Bill of Rights. The House is entitled to expect that The Bill of Rights will be fully respected by all those appearing before the courts.”***

There is a provision in the ***Bill of Rights Act 1689*** which states:

***“That all grants and promises of fines and forfeitures of a particular person before conviction are illegal and void.”***

This is confirmation that a ***conviction*** is necessary ***before*** a fine or forfeit can be imposed.

The Bill of Rights is a ***“constitutional statute”*** and may not be impliedly repealed.

This was stated in the case Thoburn v City of Sunderland, the decision commonly referred to as the ***“Metric Martyrs”*** judgment.

This was handed down in the Divisional Court on the 18th February 2002, by Lord Justice Laws and Mr Justice Crane, which is summarised below:

62. ***“We should recognise a hierarchy of Acts of Parliament: as it were ‘ordinary’ statutes and ‘constitutional statutes’. The special status of constitutional statutes follows the special status of constitutional rights.”***

63. ***“Ordinary statutes may be impliedly repealed. Constitutional statutes may not.”***

This was upheld by Lords Bingham, Scott, and Steyn in an appeal which went to the House of Lords on Monday 15 July 2002.

A statement could be put forward in writing to the police, such as:

***“I am not aware that the Road Traffic Act 1991 makes express reference to repealing the Bill of Rights Act 1689, therefore there can be no fine except for one that is imposed by a court.***

***It is therefore important that the Transport Committee considers the implications of any attempt to override the provisions of the Bill of Rights and the constitutional considerations of doing so.***

***It will then be necessary to understand the constitutional considerations of ignoring the Declaration of Rights.”***