
AbsoluteDataExchange – Heathers Reply To Freeman Delusion – 23 July 2013

Posted on [July 24, 2013](#) by [lucas2012infos](#) | Comments Off



An opponent of the Freeman movement, he calls himself (herself) “Freeman Delusion” on Facebook, posted this on FB.

“A non response (non-rebuttal) does NOT mean a judgement under UCC law....”

And he/she quotes the relevant articles. Does anyone care to respond to this?

See Below, J

ARTICLE 9 OF THE UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE

Section 140.02 Purpose Page 2

(2) The duties and responsibilities of the filing officer with respect to the administration of the UCC are ministerial. In accepting for filing or refusing to file a UCC record pursuant to 950 CMR 140.00, the filing officer does none of the following:

- Determine the legal sufficiency or insufficiency of a record.
- Determine that a security interest in collateral exists or does not exist.
- Determine that information in the record is correct or incorrect, in whole or in part.
- Create a presumption that information in the record is correct or incorrect, in whole or in part.

The validity and enforceability of a UCC filing is determined by the courts.

However, since OPPT have never had the filings heard and adjudicated in a court of law how can there have been any foreclosures?. Where is the case law on record of OPPT versus each corporation that has been allegedly filed against? Such as OPPT vs Microsoft, OPPT vs Bank of America, OPPT vs US Govt corp, and so on for every other corporation on the planet.

There is no “foreclosure” without this process. The validity of the claim is adjudicated by our own courts...

[Click to access 950CMR140.pdf](#)

“In general, Article 9 does not govern real property security interests, except for fixtures to real property. Mortgages, deeds of trust, and installment land contracts, which are the principal forms of real property security interests, remain governed by state laws.”

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Uniform_Commercial_Code

Our courts, in turn, do not recognise a Corporate Sole or a Statutory Corporation in their definition of a corporation, they are an “Exempt Public Authority”...

CORPORATIONS ACT 2001 – SECT 57A

(2) Neither of the following is a corporation :

(angel) an exempt public authority;

(beer) a corporation sole.

“exempt public authority” means a body corporate that is incorporated within Australia or an external Territory and is:

(angel) a public authority; or

(beer) an instrumentality or agency of the Crown in right of the Commonwealth, in right of a State or in right of a Territory.

http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/ca2001172/s57a.html

Heathers response:

[23/07/2013 10:07:17 PM] Jarrafusa: [Tuesday, 23 July 2013 10:08 AM]

<<< The validity and enforceability of a UCC filing is determined by the courts.No. The UCC actually tells you that it is not:

The Law of One and the principle and action aligned with the principle of Common Law of BE'ing and DO'ing what you BE, is duly preserved, protected, and guaranteed by public policy UCC 1-103, and any and all **state, **national, **international, and **universal equivalents, hidden by CODE of words “...and the law relative to capacity to contract...”, The Law of One. The BE'ing, inclusive of the value, Law and principle of Law of BE'ing is duly preserved, protected and guaranteed against damage caused by DO'ing of any other without their knowing, willing and intentional consent, by public policy UCC 1-308, and any and all **state, **national, **international, and **universal equivalents, and hidden by CODE of words “without prejudice”, damages caused by another's DO'ing. The remedy of Common law is duly preserved, protected, and guaranteed by public policy UCC 1-305(angel), and any and all **state, **national, **international, and **universal equivalents, hidden by CODE of words “...or by other rule of law.”, Remedy provided by Common Law of the Law of One. The equal right of every BE'ing to individually enforce remedy of Common Law of The Law of One is duly preserved, protected and guaranteed by public policy UCC 1-305(beer), and any and all **state, **national, **international, and **universal equivalents, and hidden by CODE of words, “unless the provision (BE'ing) declaring (DECLARATION OF FACTS) it specifies a different and limited effect (Common Law principle of The Law of One)”, (brackets) added by the Public Trust, under full responsibility and liability of its bonded Trustees of record, for clarification of Absolute Context.

THE PURPORTED COURTS HAVE NO ROLE OTHER THAN THE ONE YOU CHOOSE TO GIVE THEM....THE BANKS/FAMILIES GIVE THEM THE ROLE OF DOG AND PONY SHOW TO HIDE THE FACT THEY ARE NOT NECESSARY (chuckle)

[23/07/2013 10:08:01 PM] Jarrafusa: that data was made visible back in January ;

[www.absolute-data-exchange.com/ link to original article](http://www.absolute-data-exchange.com/link-to-original-article)

SHARE THIS: