

We identified that Article 29 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights overturns Article 29 of the Magna Carta, I don't think it is a co-incidence, this is a direct attack at English law since 1948 when the UN Charter was published. Magna Carta protects your liberties in accordance with Common Law, UN Declaration allows unlimited suspension of human rights with zero accountability or due process, normally via UN treaties.

XXIX (29) Imprisonment, &c. contrary to Law. Administration of Justice. <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/aep/Edw1cc1929/25/9/section/XXIX>

NO Freeman shall be taken or imprisoned, or be disseised of his Freehold, or Liberties, or free Customs, or be outlawed, or exiled, or any other wise destroyed; nor will We not pass upon him, nor **[X1condemn him,]** but by lawful judgment of his Peers, or by the Law of the Land. We will sell to no man, we will not deny or defer to any man either Justice or Right.

## Article 29.

(1) Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.

(2) In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.

(3) **These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.**

<https://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/>

The British have signed the UN treaty which is unlawful and Treason. The Bill of Rights forbids this treaty via the Supremacy clause.

**This page is for information only.**

## English Constitutional Defense

Statement of authorities that you rely on for your defense. These include but are not limited to The Bill of Rights 1689, The Coronation Oath Acts 1688, The Crown and Parliament Act 1688, The Act of Settlement 1701 and Ancient Laws and Customs of England. These include the Magna Carta of 1215 and 1297. None of these can be impliedly repealed nor repealed.

Magna Carta 1215 and 1275 (Current Constitutional Law)

XXIX (29) Imprisonment, &c. contrary to Law. Administration of Justice. <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/aep/Edw1cc1929/25/9/section/XXIX>

NO Freeman shall be taken or imprisoned, or be disseised of his Freehold, or Liberties, or free Customs, or be outlawed, or exiled, or any other wise destroyed; nor will We not pass upon him, nor [X1condemn him,] but by lawful judgment of his Peers, or by the Law of the Land. We will sell to no man, we will not deny or defer to any man either Justice or Right.

High Court Sunderland case Neutral Citation Number: [2002] EWHC 195, paragraph 62, 63, 64. Also we rely on [1953] ScotCS CSIH\_2, 1953 SC 396, 1953 SLT 255.

High Court Sunderland case Neutral Citation Number: [2002] EWHC 195, paragraph 61, 62, 63, 64

61 (last paragraph)

This development of the common law regarding constitutional rights, and as I would say constitutional statutes, is highly beneficial. It gives us most of the benefits of a written constitution, in which fundamental rights are accorded special respect. But it preserves the sovereignty of the legislature and the flexibility of our uncodified constitution. It accepts the relation between legislative supremacy and fundamental rights is not fixed or brittle: rather the courts (in interpreting statutes, and now, applying the HRA) will pay more or less deference to the legislature, or other public decision-maker, according to the subject in hand. Nothing is plainer than that this benign development involves, as I have said, the recognition of the ECA as a constitutional statute.

62.

Where does this leave the constitutional position which I have stated? Mr Shrimpton would say that Factortame (No 1) was wrongly decided; and since the point was not argued, there is scope, within the limits of our law of precedent, to depart from it and to hold that implied repeal may bite on the ECA as readily as upon any other statute. I think that would be a wrong turning. My reasons are these. In the present state of its maturity the common law has come to recognise that there exist rights which should properly be classified as constitutional or fundamental: see for example such cases as *Simms* [2000] 2 AC 115 per Lord Hoffmann at 131, *Pierson v Secretary of State* [1998] AC 539, *Leech* [1994] QB 198, *Derbyshire County Council v Times Newspapers Ltd.* [1993] AC 534, and *Witham* [1998] QB 575. And from this a further insight follows. We should recognise a hierarchy of Acts of Parliament: as it were "ordinary" statutes and "constitutional" statutes. The two categories must be distinguished on a principled basis. In my opinion a constitutional statute is one which (a) conditions the legal relationship between citizen and State in some general, overarching manner, or (b) enlarges or diminishes the scope of what we would now regard as fundamental constitutional rights. (a) and (b) are of necessity closely related: it is difficult to think of an instance of (a) that is not also an instance of (b). The special status of constitutional statutes follows the special status of constitutional rights. Examples are the Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights 1689, the Act of Union, the Reform Acts which distributed and enlarged the franchise, the HRA, the Scotland Act 1998 and the Government of Wales Act 1998. The ECA clearly belongs in this family. It incorporated the whole corpus of substantive Community rights and obligations, and gave overriding domestic effect to the judicial and administrative machinery of Community law. It may be there has never been a statute having such profound effects on so many dimensions of our daily lives. The ECA is, by force of the common law, a constitutional statute.

63.

Ordinary statutes may be impliedly repealed. Constitutional statutes may not. For the repeal of a constitutional Act or the abrogation of a fundamental right to be effected by statute, the court would apply this test: is it shown that the legislature's actual – not imputed, constructive or presumed – intention was to effect the repeal or abrogation? I think the test could only be met by express words in the later statute, or by

words so specific that the inference of an actual determination to effect the result contended for was irresistible. The ordinary rule of implied repeal does not satisfy this test. Accordingly, it has no application to constitutional statutes. I should add that in my judgment general words could not be supplemented, so as to effect a repeal or significant amendment to a constitutional statute, by reference to what was said in Parliament by the minister promoting the Bill pursuant to *Pepper v Hart* [1993] AC 593. A constitutional statute can only be repealed, or amended in a way which significantly affects its provisions touching fundamental rights or otherwise the relation between citizen and State, by unambiguous words on the face of the later statute.

This presents a Constitutional defense at common law.

and

[1953] ScotCS CSIH\_2, 1953 SC 396, 1953 SLT 255

“Further, the Treaty and the associated legislation, by which the Parliament of Great Britain was brought into being as the successor of the separate Parliaments of Scotland and England, contain some clauses which expressly reserve to the Parliament of Great Britain powers of subsequent modification, and other clauses which either contain no such power or emphatically exclude subsequent alteration by declarations that the provision shall be fundamental and unalterable in all time coming, or declarations of a like effect. I have never been able to understand how it is possible to reconcile with elementary canons of construction the adoption by the English constitutional theorists of the same attitude to these markedly different types of provisions.

The Lord Advocate conceded this point by admitting that the Parliament of Great Britain “could not” repeal or alter such “fundamental and essential” conditions. He was doubtless influenced in making this concession by the modified views expressed by Dicey in his later work entitled *Thoughts on the Scottish Union*, from which I take this passage (pp. 252–253):—

“The statesmen of 1707, though giving full sovereign power to the Parliament of Great Britain, clearly believed in the possibility of creating an absolutely sovereign Legislature which should yet be bound by unalterable laws.” “

That in a nutshell is your defence. Always be polite, always respect the "majesty" of the court. The Crown at the back of the court represents the ENGLISH COMMON LAW CONSTITUTION

[this looks complex but is it simple]

**The police are acting unlawfully by enforcing unlawful corona virus regulations and the fines are unlawful, detention unlawful, covered by both the Magna Carta and Bill of Rights.**