

THE TRUTH  
Circuit Court Summary Title Equity Actions – Possession  
The 2 Lacunas....and maybe another...

**INTRODUCTION:**

The following is an explanation of the issues and lacunas that existed in Irish statute - that have prevented lawful equity title actions in the state circuit court for possession of family dwellings since well before the depression of the 2000's; Despite these issues being raised continually and persistently: verbally, in notices, and on sworn affidavit, to the state actors in employment in circuit court offices and the courts, these state actors have chosen to ignore the truth laid before them, and continue on their unlawful barrage against 120,000 plus Irish families in the equity title circuit court system;

This brief outlines the statutory issues, some which have been repaired over the duration, however as such law is not retrospective, the 120,000 plus Irish families have not been told nor explained, that it was impossible for any circuit county registrar to ISSUE a valid and lawful summary title equity CIVIL BILL that complied with statute since the valuation act 2001, as the county registrar must ISSUE the original CIVIL BILL; And further they were not told nor explained, that it was impossible for any circuit county registrar to COMMENCE a valid and lawful summary title equity possession ACTION that complied with statute since the valuation act 2001, as it is ONLY the county registrar that can COMMENCE the action; As unlawful possession orders now move into double digit percentages, the lives of these Irish families are being ignored by the nation's constitutional trustee, i.e. the state known as Eire, and its rogue actors; And this is despite them knowing that repairs to lacunas in statute cannot be applied retrospectively; Financial suicides as a result of the unlawfulness have never been quantified, and there is a pervasive state resistance to quantifying, as the unlawfulness of the state actors, causes the state a future liability, which is both immeasurable and measurable;

The correct course of action, obviously is that all unlawful actions should be discontinued, and costs paid to all respondent/defendants for same discontinuance by the plaintiff, and statute provides for such a procedure; And when costs are agreed and settled, the plaintiff can take another action, if he should choose, provided he sets out his claim lawfully, within the bounds of statute; However there exists an ongoing and unlawful, state judicial and state legislative resistance to this valid statutory route, in part most likely due to the passage of time (statute barred), but primarily due to both functions being top heavy in solicitors, lawyers, barristers, bankers, etc, whose practices (past and present) earn/earned their crust from property title: sales, purchases, conveyances, registration and mortgages;

THE TRUTH  
Circuit Court Summary Title Equity Actions – Possession  
The 2 Lacunas....and maybe another...

Obviously due to this top heavy resistance, and the fact as the statutory lacunas prevented the issue of good lawful civil bills and good lawful possession orders, another simple and lawful route must be secured to protect these 120,000 plus families, from the current unlawful practises and rulings ongoing in the title equity circuit courts; When unlawfulness becomes the pervasive norm, by a state function that claims to administer lawful state justice, that state function performs a disservice to the constitutional nation, and runs the state as the Irish nations constitutional trustee for their own benefit, giving the illusion of lawful justice; These state actors breach their constitutional declaration to uphold the laws of state and the nations constitution, and step outside the bounds of their office;

When such events occur regularly and becomes the pervasive norm, the constitution always provides the superior remedy for the nations beneficiaries, its citizenry;

In this title equity scenario and by the ongoing unlawfulness in the state circuit courts, the constitution through its fundamental rights and personal rights declares in article 40.5 that - **The dwelling of every citizen is inviolable and shall not be forcibly entered save in accordance with law**. Thus having an understanding of the unlawfulness due to the lacunas, removes the underlined section of the article, and the part of article 40.5 that applies and must be upheld is - **The dwelling of every citizen is inviolable and shall not be forcibly entered..** end of story;

In article 41.1 .1° the constitution declares that - **The State recognises the Family as the natural primary and fundamental unit group of Society, and as a moral institution possessing inalienable and imprescriptible rights, antecedent and superior to all positive law**. Positive law being statutory law; However the state fails to uphold these guaranteed **inalienable and imprescriptible rights**, that it is constitutionally bound to uphold, as the nations trustee; There are other constitutional articles that are also relevant when state unlawfulness becomes the norm, such as private property rights (i.e. principal PRIVATE residence);

In closing this introduction and after having a read of the brief below, for the nations trustee to be taken seriously and to take a first step in the correct direction to remedy its regular constitutional breaches in the equity title actions since 2001, it has no choice other than to roll out a **mortgage possession moratorium in the equity title state circuit courts**, so the loss and damage the state has unlawfully heaped on 120,000 plus families to date, can be assessed, agreed and settled; Anything less at this moment in time, will inevitably cause the state to hang by a thread, and eventually be thrown and discarded, to the rewrites of history;

THE TRUTH  
Circuit Court Summary Title Equity Actions – Possession  
The 2 Lacunas....and maybe another...

**PART I: THE RIGHT TO SUE**

**HAS THE CLAIMANT MET THE STATUTORY THRESHOLD, TO ATTAIN AND ACCRUE HIS STATUTORY RIGHT TO SUE, BY WAY OF A TITLE ACTION, IN A SUMMARY MANNER, IN A STATE CIRCUIT COURT, (FOR A PRE 11<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2009 MORTGAGE)? ..... IF THE CLAIMANT HAS NOT ACCRUED THE STATUTORY RIGHT TO SUE, HIS ACTION IS UNLAWFUL – AND SUCH AN UNLAWFUL ACTION IS WITHOUT THE BENEFIT OF LAW, AND WITHOUT THE BENEFIT OF STATUTE;**

1. Is it not true, that the claimant **did fail to invoke and did fail to exercise his statutory right to sue in a summary manner in a state circuit court**, and thereby failed to comply with statute and the laws of state, namely section 1.2 of land and conveyancing law reform act 2013, when he failed to invoke and exercise same required law in the allegedly **issued “vacant” possession demand** that grounds any summary circuit court title action suit in the state? YES/NO
  
2. Is it not true, that the claimant **did fail to invoke and did fail to exercise his statutory right to sue in a summary manner in the state circuit court**, and thereby failed to comply with statute and the laws of state, namely section 1.2 of land and conveyancing law reform act 2013, when he failed to invoke and exercise same required law in the **issued civil bill** that grounds any summary circuit court title action suit in the state? YES/NO
  
3. Is it not true, that the claimant **did fail to produce proofs on any filed affidavit, that he did invoke and did exercise his statutory right to sue in a summary manner in the state circuit court**, and thereby failed to comply with statute and the laws of state, namely section 1.2 of land and conveyancing law reform act 2013, **when he failed to produce proofs on any filed affidavit** that he did invoke and did exercise same required law, that is required to ground any summary circuit court title action suit in the state? YES/NO
  
4. Is it not true, that if any claimant **fails to prove that he has invoked nor exercised section 1.2 of land and conveyancing law reform act 2013**, to invoke and exercise his statutory right to sue in a summary manner in a state circuit court for such a title action suit, **that such a title action suit is therefore grounded upon repealed laws, and therefore the claimant relies upon a conveyance lacuna in the law**, such as the repealed law for summary circuit court title actions in the state - section 62 (7) of the registration of title act 1964, which was repealed on the commencement of the land and conveyancing law reform act 2009? YES/NO

THE TRUTH  
Circuit Court Summary Title Equity Actions – Possession  
The 2 Lacunas....and maybe another...

5. Is it not true that, if the alleged **first monetary demand of the claimant, cannot be linked through a good chain of valid demands**, to the state circuit court title action suit, for wants of invoking and for wants of exercising required statute and proving same, **that there is no monetary equity under dispute in the statutory title action suit**, and any such action grounded upon zero value (0.00 euro) equity or no equity, is an unlawful dispute, for wants of equity on trust in title? YES/NO
  
6. Is it not true, that the claimant **has not accrued and has failed to accrue the statutory right to sue**, to date, as required by state law, for circuit court summary title actions to comply with section 1.2 of the land and conveyancing law reform act 2013, in regard to **alleged pre 2009 mortgage titles**? YES/NO
  
7. Is it not true, **that if a claimant cannot prove that he has invoked nor cannot prove that he exercised section 1.2 of the land and conveyancing law reform act 2013, in both the possessory demand and the civil bill and its special indorsement of claim, that there exists no lawful right invoked to sue in a statutory state court, and the action is unlawful and stands without law and stands with statutory merit**? YES/NO

**PART II: THE RIGHT TO COMMENCE THE ACTION**

**HAS THE CLAIMANT MET THE STATUTORY THRESHOLD, TO ATTAIN AND ACCRUE HIS STATUTORY RIGHT TO COMMENCE A TITLE ACTION, IN A SUMMARY MANNER, IN A STATE CIRCUIT COURT, (FOR A PRE 11<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2009 MORTGAGE)? ..... IF THE CLAIMANT HAS NOT ACCRUED THE STATUTORY RIGHT TO COMMENCE, HIS ACTION IS UNLAWFUL – AND SUCH AN UNLAWFUL ACTION IS WITHOUT THE BENEFIT OF LAW, AND WITHOUT THE BENEFIT OF STATUTE;**

8. Is it not true, that if the claimant **does fail to comply and prove he has complied with the statute in PART I above – that the claimant does not enjoy the statutory right to commence his summary title action in the circuit court, and forfeits his statutory right to commence his summary title action in the circuit court**, as he relies upon repealed law, such as section 62 (7) of the registration of title act 1964, which was repealed on the commencement of the of land and conveyancing law reform act 2009? YES/NO
  
9. Is it not true, that since the commencement of the valuation act 2001 that rateable valuation value was abolished in law, specifically in regards to domestic properties, and thus **there existed**

THE TRUTH  
Circuit Court Summary Title Equity Actions – Possession  
The 2 Lacunas....and maybe another...

**no statutory title equity to ground a possession title equity action**, as the statutory rateable valuation for such title actions was void or 0.00 Euro? YES/NO

10. Is it not true, that since the commencement of the valuation act 2001, **that the state circuit court commencement requirements pursuant to statute, namely section 22 of the courts (supplemental provisions) act 1964, or its third schedule, could not be satisfied in statute nor title equity**, as the statutory rateable valuation for such title actions was void or 0.00 Euro? YES/NO
11. Is it not true, that since the recent statutory repairs to the **state circuit court commencement requirements, for title actions, pursuant to section 22 of the courts (supplemental provisions) act 1961, and its third schedule, as commenced on the 11<sup>th</sup> January 2017, that there did not exist any mechanism to commence any statutory title action nor to commence a statutory title equity action, in the circuit court**, (unless both parties to the title action signed and filed the consent form - known as form 1a), since the commencement of the valuation act 2001? YES/NO
12. Is it not true, **that the statutory consent form – known as form 1a – that was a circuit court requirement since 2007, as referred to in Order 5 and section 22 of the courts (supplemental provisions) act 1961, was never signed by the defendant/respondent, nor filed with the county registrar nor the circuit court office?** YES/NO
13. Is it not true, **that there existed since the valuation act 2001, until the 11<sup>th</sup> January 2017, a statutory lacuna in the commencement requirements for a title suit, in statute and in law, in regard to commencing a title equity action in a state circuit court?** YES/NO
14. Is it not true, **that Westlaw has published and detailed out this statutory commencement lacuna and the repair commenced on 11<sup>th</sup> January 2017, in their release 36 dated 18<sup>th</sup> June 2019, of the consolidated circuit court rules;** In Order 5 of same release 36, section 5-03 state *“Prior to and since the establishment of the State, the jurisdiction qualification for actions relating to land in the Circuit Court has been grounded on the rateable valuation of the property. Rates were paid on all properties, whether domestic or commercial, from the 19th century Poor Law Acts. The State abolished domestic rates in 1977. However, until the Valuation Act 2001 it was still possible to obtain a rateable valuation for domestic dwellings albeit there were no rates payable on the property. This meant that the requirement for property actions in the Circuit Court could still be grounded on jurisdiction. Under the Valuation Act 2001, it was no longer*

THE TRUTH  
Circuit Court Summary Title Equity Actions – Possession  
The 2 Lacunas....and maybe another...

*possible for the Valuations Offices to mark the rateable valuation of domestic dwellings. It was still possible to obtain rateable valuations for commercial properties. **This lacuna in the law was closed by s.45 of the Civil Liability and Courts Act 2004 which amended s.22 of the Courts (Supplemental Provisions) Act 1961 and which changed the rateable valuation requirement to a market valuation. The market valuation was such that there would be very few, if any, properties which would be outside of the Circuit Court jurisdiction. However, this provision was not commenced until 11 January 2017 by virtue of the Civil Liability and Courts Act 2004 (Commencement) Order 2017 (S.I. No. 12 of 2017).***

Thus, I remind and ask again - Is it not true, **that Westlaw has published and detailed out this statutory commencement lacuna and the repair commenced on 11<sup>th</sup> January 2017, in their release 36 dated 18<sup>th</sup> June 2019, of the consolidated circuit court rules? YES/NO**

15. Is it not true, **that after the repair of this circuit court commencement lacuna, on the 11<sup>th</sup> January 2017, that title having a market value of less than 3,000,000.00 Euro became the new jurisdiction statutory gate for circuit court title equity actions? YES/NO**
  
16. Is it not true, **that if the title market value of less than 3,000,000.00 Euro is not proven by the claimant, that the claimant has not proven, validated nor verified the statutory jurisdiction requirements for all circuit court title equity action, and as such the title action cannot commence? YES/NO**
  
17. Is it not true, **that if the defendant/respondent has registered his property for property tax showing a title market value of less than 3,000,000.00 Euro, that the claimant is still required to prove, validate and verify this figure to be less than 3,000,000.00 Euro, to comply with the statutory jurisdiction requirements for circuit court title equity actions, and as such the title action cannot commence? YES/NO**
  
18. Is it not true, **that the claimant does not have any statutory right to access private tax business between the revenue/the respective council and the defendant/respondent, and as such cannot ever prove, validate and verify this figure to be less than 3,000,000.00 Euro, to comply with the statutory jurisdiction requirements for circuit court title equity actions, and as such the title action cannot commence? YES/NO**

THE TRUTH  
Circuit Court Summary Title Equity Actions – Possession  
The 2 Lacunas....and maybe another...

19. Is it not true, that if the defendant/respondent states on affidavit that he would not sell his property the subject of the action, nor the title of same, for less than 3,500,000.00 Euro or any figure above 3,000,000.00 Euro that the claimant/plaintiff can NEVER comply with the statutory jurisdiction requirements for circuit court title equity actions, and as such the title action cannot commence? YES/NO
20. Is it not true, that fine gael (and fianna fail by way of their supporting, confidence and supply agreement) deliberately introduced this property tax, and the market value equity of less than 3,000,000.00 Euro solely to enable: bank possessions in the state, repair the circuit court commencement lacuna, and so the circuit courts could monetise final possession orders, as previous possession orders could only be worth the rateable value equity ? YES/NO
21. Is it not true, that the circuit court commencement title equity lacuna existed since the commencement of the valuation act 2001, and was repaired on the 11<sup>th</sup> January 2017, and that the state legislative is complicit with the state judiciary in NOT acknowledging this fact to the people of the nation, nor to those 120,000 families in title equity actions in the circuit court, and that both and the executive of the state, have been obfuscating this fact, despite the lacuna repair being as clear as day on statute, since 11<sup>th</sup> January 2017 ? YES/NO
22. Is it not true, that if any circuit court title equity action ever laid, does not comply with section 22 of the courts (supplemental provisions) act 1961, nor complies with the third schedule of same act, that the action must be struck by the court of its own accord, pursuant to Section 22 and Order 5, for wants, in not only jurisdiction , but for wants in equity? YES/NO
23. Is it not true, that if a claimant cannot prove that he has complied with section 22 of the courts (supplemental provisions) act 1961, nor complies with the third schedule of same act, that there exists no lawful right to commence the action in a statutory state court, and the action is unlawful and stands without law and stands with statutory merit? YES/NO

**PART III: THE RIGHT TO HEAR THE ACTION**

**HAS THE CLAIMANT MET THE STATUTORY THRESHOLD, TO ATTAIN AND ACCRUE HIS STATUTORY RIGHT TO HAVE TITLE ACTION HEARD, IN A SUMMARY MANNER, IN A STATE CIRCUIT COURT, (FOR A PRE 11<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2009 MORTGAGE)? ..... IF THE CLAIMANT HAS NOT ACCRUED THE**

THE TRUTH  
Circuit Court Summary Title Equity Actions – Possession  
The 2 Lacunas....and maybe another...

*STATUTORY RIGHT TO HAVE HIS ACTION HEARD – HIS ACTION IS UNLAWFUL – AND SUCH AN UNLAWFUL ACTION IS WITHOUT THE BENEFIT OF LAW, AND WITHOUT THE BENEFIT OF STATUTE;*

24. Is it not true, that a claimant must have **complied in full, and must have proven that he has complied in full, with the referred statute in PART I and PART II above, to have accrued the right to have his summary title equity action heard under statute in a state circuit court?**  
YES/NO
25. Is it not true, **that section 3 of the land and conveyancing law reform act 2013 statute, relates solely to the hearing procedure for summary title possession actions, relating only to pre 11<sup>th</sup> September 2009 mortgages, AND that section 3 of the same act cannot be used to commence such an action?** YES/NO
26. Is it not true, **that section 3 of the land and conveyancing law reform act 2013 statute, relates solely to the hearing procedure for summary title possession actions, relating only to pre 11<sup>th</sup> September 2009 mortgages, AND that section 3 of the same act cannot be used to invoke or exercise a statutory right to sue for such an action?** YES/NO
27. Is it not true, that when a claimant relies upon **Order 5b of circuit court rules for the hearing of his summary title equity action, that Order 5b statutory hearing procedure for title possession actions, relates solely and only to post 11<sup>th</sup> September 2009 mortgages, pursuant to statute, namely the land and conveyance law reform act 2009?** YES/NO
28. Is it not true, that when a claimant relies upon **Order 5b of circuit court rules for the hearing of his summary title equity action, for a pre 11<sup>th</sup> September 2009 mortgage, that this statutory reliance is wholly unlawful, misconceived, and without the benefit of law and statute?** YES/NO
29. Is it not true, **that Order 51 of the circuit court rules is the correct statutory hearing procedure for summary title equity action for pre 11<sup>th</sup> September 2009 mortgages, issued under the registration of title act 1964 and under the land & conveyancing acts 1881-1991?** YES/NO
30. Is it not true, **that since the commencement of the land and conveyancing law reform act 2013, that a claimant can also rely upon section 3 of that act for the hearing procedure for his summary title equity action for a pre 11<sup>th</sup> September 2009 mortgage?** YES/NO



THE TRUTH  
Circuit Court Summary Title Equity Actions – Possession  
The 2 Lacunas....and maybe another...

31. Is it not true, **that if a claimant relies upon section 3 of that land and conveyancing law reform act 2013, for the hearing procedure for his summary title equity action for a pre 11<sup>th</sup> September 2009 mortgage, that he must first exercise and invoke section 1.2 of the same act, in the possessory demand that grounds the action, and he also must exercise and invoke section 1.2 of the same act in the civil bills special indorsement of claim? YES/NO**
32. Is it not true, **that a claimant can rely upon section 3 of the land and conveyancing law reform act 2013 for the hearing procedure for his summary title equity action, and that ONLY a judge of the circuit court has the statutory authority to issue a title possession order, for a pre 11<sup>th</sup> September 2009 mortgage? YES/NO**
33. Is it not true, **that a claimant can rely upon section 3 of the land and conveyancing law reform act 2013 for the hearing procedure for his summary title equity action, and that a county registrar has no right in statute nor law, to issue a title possession order, for a pre 11<sup>th</sup> September 2009 mortgage? YES/NO**
34. Is it not true, **that as both Order 51 of the circuit court rules and section 3 of the land and conveyancing law reform act 2013, seemingly appear in law to both have differing hearing procedures for summary title equity actions in a state circuit court, that neither or both Order 51 nor Section 3, can stand to be eminent nor correct authority in law, and that a lacuna cannot exist, despite the contrary, procedural, and statutory differences? YES/NO**

**PART IV: SUMMARY:**

IS THE STATE LIABLE FOR THE UNLAWFUL ACTIONS OF ITS PAID ACTORS? YES .....

35. Is it not true, **that since the commencement of the valuation act 2001 up till 11<sup>th</sup> January 2017, that it could not have been lawfully possible for a state circuit county registrar to issue a valid and lawful civil bill and special indorsement of claim, ever, due to the lacunas in statute outlined in Parts I, II & III above? YES/NO**
36. Is it not true, **that since the commencement of the valuation act 2001 up till 11<sup>th</sup> January 2017, that it could not have been lawfully possible for a state circuit court to issue a valid and lawful equity possession order, ever, due to the lacunas in statute outlined in Parts I, II & III above? YES/NO**

THE TRUTH  
Circuit Court Summary Title Equity Actions – Possession  
The 2 Lacunas....and maybe another...

- 37. Is it not true, that since the commencement of the valuation act 2001 up till 11<sup>th</sup> January 2017, that there was no statutory, nor title equity, in any title equity civil bill ever issued? YES/NO**
- 38. Is it not true, that if there exists no statutory title equity, or 0.00 Euro statutory title equity, or if statutory title equity is void and unlawful, in any equity title civil bill, that any state equity circuit court that relies on these equity lacks, does so unlawfully? YES/NO**
- 39. Is it not true, that if there exists no statutory equity value, in a state circuit court equity title civil bill action, that it is impossible to have a dispute about an equitable value of nothing (i.e. 0.00 Euro)? YES/NO**
- 40. Is it not true, that if there exists no statutory equity value, in a state circuit court equity title civil bill action, that any unlawful equity title possession order has an equitable value of nothing (i.e. 0.00 Euro), and stands as a unlawful, void and unenforceable commercial instrument in law? YES/NO**
- 41. Is it not true, that since the commencement of the valuation act 2001 up till 11<sup>th</sup> January 2017, that no statutory equity title civil bill has been constituted lawfully and pursuant to state law? YES/NO**
- 42. Is it not true, that since the commencement of the valuation act 2001 up till 11<sup>th</sup> January 2017, that every state circuit court equity title civil bill issued is fundamentally procedurally flawed, is fundamentally defective from the beginning, and stands unlawful without statute? YES/NO**
- 43. Is it not true, that all and every circuit court title action taken by equity title civil bill since 2001 to 11<sup>th</sup> January 2017, is unlawful & flawed, and was issued unlawfully by the circuits county registrar, and was commenced unlawfully by the circuits country registrar, and that the state has stood unlawfully and idly by and allowed this to happen to the irish people, to the irish nation and to the irish family dwellors, and has hidden the 2017 statutory repairs to the lacuna from the 120,000 plus families involved in circuit court equity title actions? YES/NO**
- 44. Is it not true, that the state is liable for all measurable and immeasurable loss and damage to 120,000 plus families taken by equity title civil bill since 2001 to January 2017, for all knowing and wilful unlawfulness perpetuated by its own paid state actors, in the circuit court offices, in**

THE TRUTH  
Circuit Court Summary Title Equity Actions – Possession  
The 2 Lacunas....and maybe another...

**the circuit court combined offices, in the sheriffs offices, and by the circuit court judicial office holders? YES/NO**

- 45. Is it not true, that the state is liable for all measurable and immeasurable loss and damage, caused by the persons who act unlawfully outside their state paid roles, when acting as, circuit county registrars, and circuit sheriffs/deputy sheriffs – both acting roles (two hats) by the same natural person? YES/NO**
- 46. Is it not true, that the people of the irish nation, should have no regard for state elections, nor the state results, when the acting constituency election return officers (the third hat), are one and the same natural persons, who also act in the roles as circuit county registrars, and as circuit sheriffs/deputy sheriffs, particularly when two of the three hats stand proven to act unlawfully in their paid state roles, in state circuit court equity title actions? YES/NO**
- 47. Is it not true, that the state is liable for immeasurable loss and damage by way of the many family financial suicides, caused by unlawful equity title civil bills, unlawfully issued, and unlawfully commenced by the circuit county registrars since 2001 to January 2017? YES/NO**
- 48. Is it not true, that the nation, its people and its families can rely upon section 18 of the non-fatal offences against the persons act 1997 – justifiable use of force, due to the state and its actors unlawfulness – for one to use such force by whatever means are deemed justifiably necessary, to prevent further and continued unlawfulness by the state and its actors? YES/NO**
- 49. Is it not true, that when the state goes rogue, whilst obfuscating its own unlawfulness, that it no longer acts as the nations trustee, nor acts in the nations interest, that it is no more than a pirate, or a trust pirate? YES/NO**
- 50. Is it not true, that when the state and its paid actor go rogue, whilst obfuscating its own unlawfulness, that it no longer acts as the nations trustee, and that it is no more than an unlawful pirate, and an unlawful parasite on the nation? YES/NO**
- 51. Is it not true, that trust trespass and trust piracy, are unlawful and heinous crimes; YES/NO**

THE TRUTH  
Circuit Court Summary Title Equity Actions – Possession  
The 2 Lacunas....and maybe another...

- 52. Is it not true, that the state and its paid actors are doing the nation and its people a disservice, by them no longer providing a lawful service through the circuit courts by way of equity title civil bills since 2001? YES/NO**
- 53. Is it not true, that the UK state supreme court, by thirteen to zero eminent august judicial agreement, declared that the prorogation of UK state parliament in late 2019, as orchestrated and induced by both the UK state attorney general and the UK state prime minister, was unlawful, and such unlawfulness caused the UK state executive by way of Elisabeth II's writ of approval to compound same unlawfulness – and that all members of the UK state parliament were directed to return to parliament to resume their duties, as if the prorogation never occurred, happened, or was effected in law? YES/NO**
- 54. Is it not true, that if unlawful actions by the tri-functions (judicial, executive and legislative) of the UK state can be declared unlawful and declared to have never been effected in or by law - that the irish state and certain paid state actors are only delaying the inevitable, by the obfuscation of the repairs to 2001 law, from 120,000 plus families, who hold inalienable and imprescriptible constitutional guarantees and protections, when involved in unlawful state circuit court equity title actions? YES/NO**
- 55. Is it not true, that when other state paid actors discover the unlawful actions of their fellow paid servants, who work within the confines of offices in state circuit court equity title actions, that a division will occur in the state within the paid actors, wholly manufactured by three functions of state, ignoring the festering unlawful mess since 2001? YES/NO**
- 56. Is it not true, that ignorance of the law is not a defence to unlawfulness, and stepping outside the bounds of state office, particularly when your paid state role is to administer state justice, in accordance with state statute and the irish constitution? YES/NO**
- 57. Is it not true, that despite two functions of state namely the judiciary and legislative, being top heavy in solicitors, lawyers and barristers, that not one has come out, ever, to state on the record that the repairs to lacunas, ONLY repaired future unlawfulness by state actors in unlawful state circuit court equity title actions, and despite the repairs to the law not being retrospective, they ignored, cast aside, and threw under the unlawful bus, the 120,000 plus families, involved in same such actions that were issued pre 11<sup>th</sup> January 2017? YES/NO**

THE TRUTH  
Circuit Court Summary Title Equity Actions – Possession  
The 2 Lacunas....and maybe another...

58. Is it not true, **that the only way the state and its paid actors can redeem themselves from their unlawfulness, is by calling for, and securing a mortgage possession moratorium in all state circuit court equity title actions, until such a time as, all the cumulative loss and damage upon the nation and its people since 2001, can be assessed, settled and paid, action by action;**

YES/NO

59. Is it not true, **that anything less than a secured mortgage possession moratorium in all state circuit court equity title actions, being codified in statute forthwith, falls short of what the nation constitutionally expects of the nations trustee – that trustee being the state known as eire?** YES/NO

THE TRUTH  
Circuit Court Summary Title Equity Actions – Possession  
The 2 Lacunas....and maybe another...

*Published on the 22/01/2020*

*The truth is, that it is time to right the wrongs and correct the ongoing state unlawfulness, deception, fraud and corruption, and remove & replace the nations trustee(s) if necessary;*

*It up to you when acting as a state voter, to NOT vote these unlawful parasites in again.... boycott, boycott, boycott...*

*Not one party seeking your vote, will ever address this persistent circuit court equity title unlawfulness, unless you put this issue to them.....*

*Share this truthful information with everyone you desire, and stand on the laws the unlawful state actors break;*

*If involved in such a circuit court possessory title action, cherry pick relevant passages from above, that apply to the action, and send to the state county registrar, to the state circuit court judge, to the state circuit court office and its employees, to the bank and its employees, to the banks solicitors and employees, to the banks barrister, and to the three head functions of state – the executive, the legislative and the judiciary etc... and put it on a filed affidavit, if needs be...*

*The financial suicides of the past, caused by such unlawful state circuit court actions – deserve this stance against unlawfulness, as a tribute to their memory;*

*This cannot be allowed continue, nor happen again, to our cherished future generations;*

*Now is the time, to make YOUR stand, for a better nation, and a better future.....*