

**Ohio Circuit Court of Record
Seated at Chillicothe**

Feb 27 2025

Ohio Circuit Court of Record

Katherine Hine, a living woman,
on her own behalf and on behalf
of the other owners of HiRGG
Properties, pma, a Private
Membership Association

Claimants,

vs-

Tonya Free, et al

Respondents.

Case No. 24-ROS-003

**JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT
IMPOSING SANCTIONS
FOR CONTEMPT, ARMED
ASSAULT & EXTORTION**

NOW ON this 27th day of February, 2025, upon three of our members having assembled, our Lord and King Jesus Christ thereby being in our midst, our Court having been lawfully formed in 2021 after having provided all lawful public Notices during 2020 and having been operating publicly and without objection for more than three (3) years as a Court of record administering the common law as the earthly expression of the ultimate law of God, bowing only to His ultimate sovereignty, conducting ourselves consistently with our understanding of the superior law of Almighty God and, wherever possible, consistently with Respondents' 1781 and 1787 Constitutions for the united states of America, the Declaration of Independence, the Northwest Ordinance, and Magna Carta, among other treatises and founding documents, having reviewed Claimants' verified September 29, 2024 post-judgment Notice, in which they specifically named as Supplemental Respondents: Tina Large, John Street, Toni Eddy, Michelle Arnold, Sharon Kennedy, Katherine Weinland, George Lavender, Ron Myers, Jody Walker, LeeAnn Cornyn, their agents, principals, and contractors, having also reviewed Claimants' second and third Notices, exhibits, proofs of service and affidavits of non-response, we FIND by agreement of the parties, by a preponderance of the evidence, and beyond any reasonable doubt as follows:

1. It is a matter of public record on the Docket page of this Court's website that lawful judgment herein was already rendered without objection against original Respondents Free and McCray on September 10, 2024, granting Claimants restoration of possession of their land and the structures thereon. Said judgment was based on a binding written common law contract executed on August 11, 2023 between said original Respondents and Claimants, all as men and women, not as legal fiction persons.

2. None of the Respondents have ever voiced any objection to the verified facts set forth in the Three (3) Notices filed and served upon them three (3) times following our September 10, 2024 Order against original Respondents Free and McCray. The first of said Notices, dated September 29, 2024, followed by Respondents' three (3) defaults thereon, established that Respondents Free and McCray perjured themselves and that Respondent Weinland suborned said perjury, supposedly with awareness of penalties for perjury, by means of a September 17, 2024 corporate document presented to Respondent Street.

3. Not one of Supplemental Respondents, his or her agents, principals, or contractors has any authority to interfere with the right of people such as original Respondents and Claimants to contract with one another, nor, of course, would it be possible for a mental construct known as a corporation, such as those employing Supplemental Respondents, to have any such authority.

4. By agreement among all parties, Claimant Katherine Hine and the other Claimants with whom she has formed a common law private membership association, are the true owners of the land and structures known to Respondents as 189, 189 ½, and 189 REAR East Water Street, Chillicothe, Ohio and are entitled to exclusive possession of the rental home known as 189 ½ East Water Street.

5. Claimants herein have at all times been and remain the owners of the aforementioned land and the structures thereon, in the name of their common law private membership association, HiRGG Properties, pma. The legal fiction entity known as HiRGG PROPERTIES, LLC, by definition, never actually existed.

6. Supplemental Respondents are men and women who admittedly use fictionalized perversions of their names, i.e. the all-capital versions thereof, to pose as agents of one or more private, for-profit corporations masquerading as "government". In the course of operating said corporations by proxy, Respondents Kennedy, Street, Eddy, Weinland, and Gnatowski, the latter being an agent of Respondent Weinland, ignore the common law and the law of God. They instead purport to administer corporate policies known as statutes, codes, and ordinances, but regularly refuse to even adhere to those. We will address this duplicitous conduct throughout this Judgment.

7. One egregious example of the many refusals of all Respondent BAR members, their agents, contractors, and superiors, to adhere even to their own corporate policies, is their notorious participation in and profiteering from contracts, combinations, series of contracts and the execution of other acts that create and maintain commercial activity within a system of corporate pronouncements designed to deceive the people into widespread but false beliefs that:

- (a) such pronouncements are "law",
- (b) that the only source of justice in the lives of the people comes through the counsel of BAR members, and
- (c) that only BAR members may lead the people effectively through the maze thus created. Such acts of common law barratry, are designed to generate revenue for Respondents and their principals at the expense of others, thereby restraining trade or commerce and engaging in overt acts of monopolization, all prohibited by Sections 1 and 2 of Respondents' Sherman Antitrust Act also known as 15 U.S.C. Ch. 1. Another of the parent corporation's policy statutes, known as the Clayton Act [15 U.S.C. § 15 (1964)] provides for treble damages to "persons" who are injured. Claimants, not being "persons", make no such claim. However, it is instructive to observe that the seriousness of infractions of Section 2 of the Clayton Act committed by those, who, like Respondents, have acted as persons "shall be deemed guilty of a felony due to participation or attempted participation in monopolistic practices."

8. No corporate policy enactment, by its own terms, applies to living people.

9. Claimants' September 29, 2024 Notice, together with their second and third notices, constituted a contract offer, which all Respondents accepted by their silences and by engaging in the conduct specified

in the Notices. That conduct included without limitation:

- (a) BAR member Respondents' preparation of corporate documents labeled as 24 CVH 1824, with Respondent BAR members' full knowledge of the well-known track record of Respondents Lavender and Myers for unlawful armed violence;
- (b) Supplemental Respondents' dissemination of documents likely to be understood as written threats of armed violence and trespass against Claimants and their land; and
- (c) Respondents' use of documents pertaining to said corporate matter, currently known as 24 CVH 1824, in an attempt to interfere with Claimants' original September 10, 2024 judgment in Case Number 24-ROS-003 from this Court, or any subsequent judgment that we render thereafter, including this one.

10. Claimants and Respondents, together with all their agents, principals, and contractors, have all authorized us to incorporate into a Judgment, the terms of their said Contract resolving all matters previously in dispute between them as people.

11. All Respondents have now on three (3) occasions admitted that the authority of this Court is based on the superior law of Almighty God over all men and women living on the land He created. We further FIND that Supplemental Respondents' claimed authority, on the contrary, is based on corporate profit motives. Respondent Street's similar admissions in the matter of *Hine v Ater* 24 ROS-004, is a matter of record as can be viewed on our online docket. www.occr2021.com.

12. The word of Almighty God, who Respondents have admitted is the ultimate earthly sovereign (Public Law 97-280), acknowledges that un rebutted verified notices such as Claimants' stand as truth: 1 Peter 1:25; Hebrews 6:13-15. Holy Bible, KJV.

13. Claimants' Notices, based on Jesus's instructions from Matthew 18:15-17, which warn Respondents of the consequences of their silences and/or conduct, are likewise hardly unknown in Respondents' corporate world of commerce. Claimants' un rebutted affidavits supporting their Notices admittedly stand as truth, even according to Respondents' commercial policy enactments, such as UCC Sec. 1-202. Respondents' corporate policy enactment known as 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1746 likewise specifically concedes that the affidavits supporting the facts contained in Claimants' Notices constitute proof of the affidavits' contents. Moreover, Roman civil law, which Respondent BAR members are fond of citing, happens to also be in accord: *Qui non negat, fatetur*. I.e. He who does not deny, agrees.

14. Original Respondents Free and McCray have never disputed that:

- (a) they were in breach of the August 11, 2023 contract between themselves and Claimants, that
- (b) they refuse to pay rent, or that
- (c) Claimants are entitled to exclusive possession of their land as we originally ordered on September 10, 2024.

15. We make the following further FINDINGS, applying the admitted facts conceding that all true law comes from God, the one lawgiver (James 4:12), not from corporate policy:

- (a) BAR member Respondents Street, Eddy, Weinland, and their agent Gnatowski are all admittedly well

aware that each is prohibited by the original 13th Amendment to their 1787 Constitution, from serving in positions of public trust and are all likewise prohibited from so serving because of their refusals to allow the all-capital fictions created from their names to comply with their superiors' corporate policy enactment known as the Foreign Agent Registration Act.

(b) The Bible is the source of the common law maxim and principle that men and women may not administer that which they did not create. Isaiah 29:16; John 15:20; Job 40:2; Romans 9:20. Respondent Street's September 19, 2024 document, which he or an agent of his signed purportedly on behalf of a fictitious corporate tribunal, is evidence that he recognizes these principles as well. When Respondent Street, the man, acted in a legal fiction role in the corporate matter known to Respondents as 24 CVH 1824, he avoided ordering Claimant Katherine Hine, the woman, or any of the other Claimant men and women by name or as living people, to do anything. Any current or future statements of corporate position emanating from Respondent BAR members' activities using legal fiction labels are inapplicable to living people and incapable of granting any rights or creating any duties.

(c) Respondent Street admits that he administers a private, for-profit corporation, a legal fiction having no corporeal existence, which also fails to meet BAR member Respondents' own definition of being a court at all. Respondents also admits that the people have superior earthly authority to govern, as was conceded long ago by Respondent BAR members' superiors in *Chisholm v. Georgia*, 419 U.S. 2 (1793) and as Almighty God has long ago instructed the people to carry out. Genesis 1:26. Consistently with these admissions, Respondents' so-called September 19, 2024 "Temporary Restraining Order" along with any other documents bearing the corporate identifier of 24 CVH 1824, or otherwise, further demonstrate Respondents' admission that no corporate tribunal can have authority over living people, including Katherine Hine or any of the other people who are Claimants and members of the common law private membership association known as HiRGG Properties pma.

(d) Respondents' usages of the legal fiction all caps name is a non-standard bastardization of English grammar rules applicable only to proper names, according to BAR member Respondents' own style manuals. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-STYLEMANUAL-2008/pdf/GPO-STYLEMANUAL-2008-5.pdf>. Other style manuals in common usage in the corporate legal world agree. E.g. *Chicago Manual of Style* (14th Ed.), *Manual on Usage & Style*, (8th Ed.), ISBN I-878674-51-X (1995: Tex. L. Rev.) Section D (prohibiting the usage of all caps to refer to litigants); NASA/SP-7084: NASA Special Publication: Grammar, Punctuation, and Capitalization, a Handbook for Technical Writers and Editors (1998: NASA Langley Research Center, Hampton, Va.) Sec. 4.1 (specifically prohibiting all caps usages such as "STATE OF NEW YORK"). This means that KATHERINE HINE, sometimes called a "person", is an entity Claimant never created or knowingly authorized, and is not the equivalent of Katherine Hine, the woman.

(e) God is the sovereign over all and is no respecter of persons. Nor must we be. Proverbs 28:21; Acts 10:34; James 2:9; Romans 2:11. Luke 20:21; Job 13:10, 32:21, Psalm 82:2.

Legal fiction persons, invented by man, are not the equivalent of people, created by God. Respondent Street recognizes this distinction. Hence, Respondent Street's documents are basically meaningless because the legal fiction role known as HONORABLE JOHN B. STREET could not possibly have authority over living people. It makes no difference that the man, Respondent Street, may have pinned false and fictitious labels, such as DEFENDANT, onto the people we refer to here as Claimants.

(f) Respondents' corporate policy enactments generally exclude the use of the terms men and women, since corporate agents know they lack authority over God's creations. No man or woman has the power or ability to change another man or woman into a legal fiction "person" for his or her own covetous purposes, as BAR member Respondents may be attempting.

(g) Respondents' superior and predecessor, William Clinton, admitted in 1999, in a rare usage of the term "people", not "persons", that the "people of the State are free . . . to define the moral, political and legal character of their lives." "Executive Order" 13132, Section 2.

(h) Respondents are not free to define people or their contracts with one another, to suit Respondents' corporate revenue generating purposes. Saying otherwise does not make it so. Respondents are not entitled to pin inaccurate labels on Claimants in order to interfere with their contract, as people, with original Respondents, also people. By attempting to do so, Supplemental Respondents defy not only their superiors' Executive Order 13132, but also their 1787 Constitution Art. 1, Sec. 10 prohibition against contract interference.

We further FIND:

16. Respondents Street, Weinland, Kennedy, and Gnatowski, as people, admittedly have no authority to commit the common law tort known as interference with contract against either Claimants or original Respondents, all of whom are people, not legal fiction persons.

17. Respondent Street, even when playing the role of HONORABLE JOHN B. STREET, has no authority to tell Respondents Lavender or Myers, the men, or their agents, what to do, when those men are not "on the job".

18. Respondent Street demonstrates that he knows that Claimants are all living beings created by God Almighty, not by the corporate State, by refraining from using Claimants' actual birth names when expressing his self-serving desire that they take no steps to enforce our September 10, 2024 Order. In any event, there is no allegation by anyone, much less, evidence, that Claimants have any interest in utilizing the services of any of Respondent Street's agents in the enforcement of our September 10, 2024 Order or the within Judgment.

19. There is nothing in Respondents' corporate documents dated September 19, 2024, October 11, 2024 or any date thereafter, that would impede Claimants from enforcing the August 11, 2023 contract they have with original Respondents Free and McCray, our September 10, 2024 Order, or the within Judgment.

20. We therefore FIND that original Respondents' plan to admittedly use fraud, perjury, and other trickery in an effort to relieve themselves of their lawful contract obligations to Claimants is ineffective. The documents pertaining to the corporate matter known as 24 CVH 1824 dated September 19, 2024 or otherwise, provide no immunity either to original Respondents, Free and McCray, or to any of the Supplemental Respondents as people created by the Almighty, all of whom remain fully liable for any harm they have caused and are causing to Claimants, as people, due to their acts of contract interference, extortion, and other acts attempting to harm them.

21. Although doing so is completely unnecessary to support our decision herein, we make additional FINDINGS to illustrate the lengths that Respondent BAR members and their predecessors have historically gone, to feather their own nests while portraying themselves as solicitous of the people's welfare. Tracing Respondent BAR members' use of the contrived subterfuge of "unconscionability" from its inception, we note as follows:

(a) In the matter of *SCOTT v. UNITED STATES*, 79 U.S. 443 (1870), Respondent BAR members' predecessors, in order to benefit their associates or agents who had foolishly entered into a disadvantageous contract, conjured up the notion that such contract was "unconscionable" using the following rationalizations:

"Where parties intend to contract by parol, and there is a misunderstanding as to the terms, neither is bound, because their minds have not met. Where there is a written contract, and a likely misunderstanding is developed, a court of equity will refuse to execute it. If a contract be unreasonable and unconscionable, but not void for fraud, a court of law will give to the party who sues for its breach damages, not according to its letter, but only such as he is equitably entitled to."

(b) Neither Street nor any of the other Respondents even alleged that any evidence existed suggesting that the August 11, 2023 contract contained a "likely misunderstanding" or that original Respondents Free and McCray, as people, not persons, were somehow misled about the contract term providing that all disputes were to be resolved by this Court.

(c) Since *SCOTT*, the notion of "unconscionability", contrived by BAR members, for BAR members, has expanded so as to selectively interfere with legal and lawful contracts, which remain unquestionably enforceable. The term "unconscionability" has never been well defined or its existence anything but dubious even in the fictitious world of corporations masquerading as "courts". According to a legal treatise by Paul Bennett Marrow, author of "Contractual Unconscionability: Identifying and Understanding Its Potential Elements": "Inherent in the statutory scheme is the assumption that unconscionability actually exists".

(d) Superiors and predecessors of BAR member Respondents invented ever more vague theories over the years to justify their notion of "unconscionability", including without limitation: (i) whether the contract was one-sided, oppressive and likely to result in unfair surprise, (ii) whether its effect was deemed profoundly discriminatory to one of the contracting parties; (iii) whether the contract contained language attempting to sanction abusiveness, arbitrariness or the imposition of a needlessly burdensome condition; and (iv) whether the contract contained language the real meaning of which was intentionally obscured from one of the parties. Respondents assert not even one of these highly subjective elements to have existed in the August 11, 2023 contract between Original Respondents and Claimants, which contract we again FIND to be simple, straightforward and fully enforceable on its face.

(e) Lacking any means of plausibly using their rigged "unconscionability" theory to stand alone, Respondent BAR members fused "unconscionability" with one of their superiors' corporate policy enactments, i.e. Ohio Rev. Code. Sec. 5321.20. but found they had to completely ignore the overall general policy goal of that same enactment, namely, the "maintenance of an adequate housing supply including access to livable, clean, and well-maintained residential rental premises, . . . an urgent statewide priority and necessary to the well-being of Ohioans."

(f) BAR member Respondents had to also completely ignore most of the *specific* provisions of Sec. 5321.20, using the entity known as HONORABLE JOHN B. STREET to produce a document that, contrary to stated corporate policy goals, would (i) suppress rental and property values, (ii) discourage maintenance, upkeep and rehabilitation of rental homes, (iii) unnecessarily remove rental homes from the rental home market, (iv) cause deterioration of rental homes, (v) misallocate rental homes, thereby interfering with employment, (vi) discourage investment, (vii) engineer scarcity of adequate rental housing, (viii) distort the functioning of the rental home market, (ix) create unnecessary administrative and enforcement expenses, and (x) retroactively deprive rental home owners of their property rights.

(g) BAR member Respondents refuse to explain their deviations from their own corporate policies while at the same time using those very same policies to prop up their notion of "unconscionability".

(h) The August 11, 2023 contract between living people Free and McCray, and Hine and her associates, also living people, was never any of Respondent BAR members' concern in the first place. We also FIND that this contract contained no "misunderstanding", no ambiguity, no abusiveness, no attempt to discriminate, no needless burden and no intentional or unintentional obscuring of the terms of said contract and Respondents never said otherwise.

(i) Original Respondents simply decided that they wanted to again breach the contract, having previously breached it by having brought in other people onto Claimants' private property, but wanted to also enjoy the benefits of living rent-free without consequence. Said original Respondents found willing assistance in their lawless plan to get something for nothing, as Respondents Weinland, Street, and Gnatowski had similarly covetous purposes of their own.

(j) Respondent Street saw an opportunity to further his own purposes, to drum up business for his corporate employer's eviction agent through its Court Registry Investment System (CRIS). Using CRIS, Respondent Street, like the Judean politician, Pashhur, delivers the wealth of his own people into the hands of their enemies. Jeremiah 20. But Claimants' refusal to surrender to Street's extortionate pressure to accept the "person" label and pay the fees needed to hire Street's eviction "person" defeated Respondents' purposes.

(k) Regardless of any contrivance BAR member Respondents and their accomplices may invent to give themselves plausible deniability, or imagined "immunity" for their acts of extortion, contract interference and the associated threats of violence that accompany same, they remain liable for the natural and probable consequences of their acts.

22. It is a matter of common knowledge that when "on the job" Respondents Lavender and Myers regularly engage in or direct their agents and contractors to engage in acts of violence on behalf of Respondent BAR members. All Supplemental Respondents are hereby informed that any "just doing my job" theory of defense, is no more available to insulate them from liability for the consequences of their acts of violence or threatened violence than it was to the Nazi criminals at Nuremberg post World War Two, who unsuccessfully tried it.

23. The law of God, under which Respondents have admitted that they should be operating, (P.L. 97-280), instructs Claimants as well as us to "[s]hun the dens of iniquity when seeking earthly justice", to judge "what is right" (Luke 12:57), and to "walk not in the counsel of the ungodly" (Psalms 1:1) populated by Respondent BAR members and their cohorts.

24. We further FIND that Respondent Street, using Weinland's wording, scorns God and sneers at this Court of God, assembled in His name, by referring to it as "so called". None of the corporate BAR agent Respondents claims that a provision in a contract for choice of forum in the only tribunal in Ross County that is actually a court, is somehow inherently "unconscionable". Indeed, as verified public notices posted on our website since 2020 establish, the Ohio Circuit Court of Record has been operating for nearly five years just around the corner from where Respondent Street has been conducting his criminal operation, without one word of objection from him or his superiors during that time. But now he wants to scoff and sneer.

25. We again FIND that Respondent Street does appear to understand that he lacks authority to order Claimants, or even Respondents themselves as living people, created by God Almighty, to do or to refrain from doing anything because the wording of his corporate documents is limited to addressing legal

fictions such as HONORABLE JOHN B. STREET, DEFENDANTS, PLAINTIFFS, RESIDENTS, CITIZENS, and/or other corporate contrivances. Neither Respondents nor Claimants are any of those labels, nor are we.

26. We further FIND that neither Respondents Lavender nor Myers, neither individually or through their agents, have any authority, as people, or otherwise, to act on behalf of any Supplemental Respondents and do so at their peril. Respondents Lavender, Myers, and their agents have no authority to trespass onto Claimants' land or onto their contract rights, whether by confabulating the terms people and persons, or by means of any other pretext. As living people and on their own time, Respondents Lavender, Myers and their agents, are free, as we all are, to engage in whatever contracts they choose to enter with other living people without interference by others.

27. Respondents Lavender, Myers, and their agents and contractors are not free to misinterpret the "Orders" of Respondent Street, which on their face apply only to legal fictions, and not to real people. Nor are they free to add in new provisions of their own or new directives from Respondent Street to justify trespasses on Claimants' land or to interfere with any contract Claimants may hereafter enter to assist in taking possession of Claimants' property.

96.6.
JP
vms
28. We FIND, according to admissions contained in Respondents' own corporate policy enactments and in Respondents' own admissions, that Respondents Lavender and Myers have no duty to protect or serve any man, woman, boy or girl and therefore have no business trespassing on Claimants' private property land. *Castle Rock v. Gonzales*, 545 U.S. 748 (2005); *Warren v. District of Columbia*, 444 A.2d. 1, D.C. Ct./App, 1981). They likewise have no authority or even pretext for carrying weapons upon the people's land, on the public roadways, or otherwise. Respondents Lavender, Myers, their agents, superiors and contractors as well as Respondent Walker likewise have no duty or authority in the corporate world to protect children, or to pretend to do so, even when doing so could prevent foreseeable murders of children. *DeShaney v. Winnebago County*, 489 U.S. 189 (1989).

29. We therefore FIND that none of the Respondents, as living people, is authorized to do anything Respondent Street directs them to do by means of corporate item number 24 CVH 1824 because Respondent Street, the man, has no authority over living people when enacting the corporate role of "HONORABLE JOHN B. STREET".

30. We further FIND that all Respondents are in contempt of our Orders and subject to not only monetary and injunctive orders but also to new sanctions for contempt. Under English common law, courts of a supposedly anointed monarch were always considered to have the inherent power to punish individuals who showed contempt for their authority. As Respondents' predecessors long ago admitted during the period following centuries of usurpations by those claiming a divine right to rule, the people of the American continent became the new monarchs, monarchs without subjects and the source of all earthly law.

31. Both common law and corporate policy contempt theories derive from the concept of mocking the Almighty, the ultimate sovereign, in the presence of Whom and under Whose authority we assemble, while Respondents act in the name of corporate revenue generation, notwithstanding the Bible's longstanding documentation of God's displays of wrath against those who pervert His word with

commercial activity. Matthew 21:12-17.

32. Those who mock God's messengers and despise His words ignite God's anger and the withdrawal of His patience. 2 Chronicles 36:16; Luke 10:16. Our authority to punish for contempt is based not only on the nature of contempt of a common law Court but also based on the overarching concept that mockers of God reap what they sow. Galatians 6:7.

33. We further FIND that other specific factors aggravate Respondents' acts of contempt as to our September 10, 2024 Judgment for Emergency Order:

(a) Respondents' actions set forth hereinabove invite the infliction of private and public nuisances because Respondents' threats and acts of trespass admittedly harm, annoy and physically disturb Claimants and their other tenants in the peaceful, God given right to the quiet and lawful enjoyment of their private property land and the structures thereon affixed.

(b) Respondent Street defies the policies of his own commercial world of corporate legalisms, as we discussed hereinabove.

(c) Supplemental Respondents Street, Eddy, Lavender, and any appointing them are admitted usurpers, having never been credibly elected to anything.

(d) Respondents Street, Eddy and Lavender continue to take evasive measures to conceal and/or disable their email addresses and/or fax numbers, as we previously determined in the matter of *Hine v. Ater*, 24-ROS-004, thereby causing service of Notices upon them by such means (but not by agent), impossible and also revealing the deceptive nature of any representations they may make as to being "public" employees.

(e) Respondents Lavender and Myers, along with their agents, have defied our prior Orders to surrender their weapons on their own, as required of them by our default judgment in *Hine v. Ater*. Case No. 24-ROS-004 (pp. 9-10, paragraphs 12 and 13), although such ongoing refusals to surrender their weapons also constitute further acts of consent by conduct to the Contract Offer contained in Claimants' original September 29, 2024 Notice.

34. We specifically FIND, for purposes of instruction and warning not only to Respondents but also to the public, that the Bible documents many examples of the raw power of God's displays of wrath, usually due to man's inclinations towards idolatry and sexual perversion. We summarize here just a small fraction of God's displays of wrath against reprobate man:

(a) eviction of Adam and Eve from an earthly paradise;

(b) bringing on a worldwide Flood, wiping out all but eight (8) of His elect; who had obeyed God's instructions to build an arc, the existence of which seems to have been confirmed archeologically;

(c) annihilation of the people of Sodom and Gomorrah, by a fire and brimstone attack, physical evidence of which remains;

(d) visiting of plagues of frogs, flies, gnats, cattle deaths, and then infant deaths against the obstinate slave driver Pharaoh;

(e) drowning of Pharaoh's troops in the Red Sea, archeological remnants of destroyed chariots and human remains having been documented in 1978 and verified in subsequent years, once the correct portion of the Red Sea was explored;

(f) opening up of the earth and swallowing of Korah and his fellow rebels against the Godly authority of

Moses and Aaron; Numbers 16:1- 35;

(g) multiple impositions of captivity using pagan conquerors such as Nebuchadnezzar, as instruments of His wrath; (h) destruction of 185,000 Assyrian troops 2 Kings 19:35-37.

35. We further FIND reason to believe that more recent displays of the consequences of mockery of God have been credibly established, from the world of corporate entertainment, ranging from such defiant people once known as Marilyn Monroe, John Lennon, Michael Jackson, and historical figures including without limitation Voltaire, Marquis de Sade, Friedrich Nietzsche, Madalyn Murray O'Hair, and a host of Hollywood celebrities whose defiance of God and ties to occult worship are becoming common knowledge, some of which may possibly explain the recent destruction of much of Los Angeles by fire.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED BY THE COURT AS FOLLOWS:

1. RESPONDENTS' LIABILITIES AS MEN AND WOMEN: Respondents having voiced no objection or other response to date, we hereby adopt the agreement they have tacitly made with Claimants and hereby render Judgment supplementing our September 10, 2024 Judgment entered herein, said Judgment, as are all of our Judgments, being limited to addressing Respondents as living men and women and not as corporate actors for hire, playing a role. This Judgment applies with equal force to any man or woman acting as agent, principal or contractor of any Respondent, each being subject to the same monetary and injunctive judgments as are the currently named Respondents and Supplemental Respondents.

2. MONETARY JUDGMENT: Claimant Katherine Hine and the other men and women doing business as HiRGG Properties, pma, a non-corporate common law association of people, is hereby granted judgment in the sum of Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$50,000.00) against Respondents Tonya Free, Greg McCray, John Street, Katherine Weinland, and their agents and contractors, jointly and severally, as compensation for the loss of value of that portion of Claimants' land caused by their actions. A UNITED STATES dollar is defined herein and by the Coinage Acts of 1792 and 1900 as being 24.8 grains of gold or 371.25 grains of silver.

3. COLLECTION OF MONETARY JUDGMENT: In the case of failure to pay any fees, contempt sanctions, or monetary judgments within thirty (30) days of presentment of a Bill following the entering of this Judgment, all land or other property belonging to any Respondent wherever situated is, by agreement, subject to lien, levy, distraint, distress, certificate of exigency, impound, execution, and his or her income subject to garnishment, and all other lawful, equitable, and/or commercial remedies, including without limitation, injunction and ejectment. All Supplemental Respondents shall provide fully executed copies of any and all bonds, insurance policies, or underwriter agreements, if any, that would compensate Claimants for the harm and loss Respondents have caused and continue to cause them, their agents, principals, or associates. Respondents' monetary liabilities imposed herein are hereby DECLARED to be non-dischargeable *via* any corporately created statutory "bankruptcy" or otherwise, since such corporate policy proceedings are inapplicable to Respondents, who are all living people.

4. CLAIMANTS' RIGHT TO EXCLUSIVE POSSESSION: Exclusive possession of the dwelling located at 189 ½ East Water Street, Chillicothe, Ohio is hereby RESTORED to its owners, Claimants Katherine Hine and her agents and associates at HiRGG Properties, pma, at such time and upon such occasion as they may choose following the posting of this Judgment on our website. Tonya Free, Greg

McCray and all others found at said location, shall vacate it forthwith. All Respondents, their agents, contractors, and principals are hereby ENJOINED from directly or indirectly interfering or attempting to interfere with the August 11, 2023 contract between Claimants and Respondents Tonya Free and Greg McCray.

5. NON-INTERFERENCE: All Respondents, their agents, principals, and contractors are hereby prohibited and ENJOINED from:

- (a) commencing or continuing any acts of trespass against Claimants or against their land;
- (b) interfering in any manner with Claimants' exclusive right to the possession and quiet enjoyment of said private property known as 189, 189 ½, or 189 REAR East Water Street, Chillicothe, Ohio;
- (c) interfering in any manner with any man or woman acting to enforce this Judgment, the August 11, 2023 contract, or the September 10, 2024 Judgment for Emergency Order issued herein;
- (d) making threats against Claimants;
- (e) carrying firearms or other weapons of any type onto Claimants' private property land, or
- (f) committing other acts of common law armed or unarmed assault, trespass, extortion, battery, or robbery against any Claimants, their agents, guests, or tenants.

26b.
ap
mp
6. VOID CORPORATE DOCUMENTS: All Respondents shall take heed that any and all documents issued in corporate matter 24 CVH 1824 from any corporate tribunal including without limitation one referred to as "CHILLICOTHE MUNICIPAL COURT" provide no justification or authority for Respondents to commit any of the acts ENJOINED hereinabove. All said documents are admittedly void, confer no rights or immunities to anyone, benefit no living people, and are of no effect. Respondent men and women, their agents, principals, and contractors are all prohibited and ENJOINED from committing any acts interfering with this Judgment. This includes without limitation all acts of violence based on any document bearing the corporate identifier CVH 1824 or any other label emanating from Respondent John Street or from any other man or woman purporting to act on behalf of any corporate tribunal masquerading as a court regardless of what its agents call it.

7. WEAPONS SURRENDER AND CONFISCATION, PUBLIC AUTHORIZATION, AND NEIGHBORHOOD PATROLS:

- (a) Since Supplemental Respondents, their agents, principals and contractors admittedly have no duty to protect or serve the people and since some of them are likely to misinterpret Respondent Street's documents as authorizing them to commit acts of violence upon Claimants or to trespass upon their land in contravention of our Orders, and given the well documented history of violence that Respondents' Lavender and Myers are known to commit or oversee against the people of Ross County, Ohio, this Court HEREBY ENJOINS all Supplemental Respondents, their agents, contractors, and principals from using or being in possession of any weapons while purportedly acting on behalf of corporate employers and we hereby ORDER them to surrender said weapons to an agent of any Ohio Neighborhood Patrol or of Ohio Circuit Court of Record, the latter being located at 43 South Paint Street, Chillicothe, Ohio.
- (b) Respondents Lavender and Myers SHALL SURRENDER their own weapons, purchased directly or indirectly by Ohio taxpayers, and they SHALL confiscate the weapons of their own agents as well as those of all other Respondents including without limitation Respondents Free, McCray, Street, Weinland and Gnatowski. This ordered confiscation and surrender of weapons in use by Respondents Lavender and

Myers themselves shall not apply to those arms used defensively as essential to defense of their homes or for jail administration, as determined by members of this Court or our designees.

(c) Any member of the Ohio public is hereby authorized to CONFISCATE any weapon in the possession of any Respondent or his or her agent or contractor contrary to this Order, whether or not said Respondent or agent is wearing a costume, displaying a badge, or otherwise masquerading as part of "government". Within 24 hours of seizure, all such firearms shall be surrendered to and marked for identification by agents of Ohio Circuit Court of Record at 43 South Paint Street, Chillicothe, Ohio, who can be contacted as indicated on the Court's website: www.occr2021.com.

(d) Public weapons confiscation and any subsequent distribution for defensive neighborhood purposes, shall be conducted on a first come, first served basis and upon written request from any member of the public operating a neighborhood patrol so long as the patrol member conducting the confiscation or assisting in the weapons surrender provides signed written assurance that he or she intends to use said firearms exclusively for self-defense purposes and as part of any such neighborhood patrol operating within the original Ohio republic. Agents of Ohio Circuit Court of Record shall maintain records of said confiscated or surrendered firearms, which records shall remain confidential. All fees for OCCR to administer this public service, if any, shall be billed to and paid by Supplemental Respondents.

8. SANCTIONS FOR PAST, ONGOING, AND FUTURE ACTS OF CONTEMPT:

966.
ad
my
(a) For their acts of ongoing contempt which Respondents Tonya Free and Greg McCray are committing by continuing to trespass on Claimants' land, where they use illicit drugs and endanger Respondent Free's children, we hereby impose a sentence of nine (9) months continuous incarceration in the facility known as ROSS COUNTY JAIL, located at 28 North Paint Street, Chillicothe, Ohio and currently operated by Respondent Lavender and his agents, who act ostensibly as servants of the people. Said incarcerations shall be for execution immediately upon leaving a copy of this Judgment at the rental home. All costs associated with removing Respondents Free and McCray and for incarcerating them shall be assumed entirely by Respondents Tonya Free, Greg McCray, John Street, Katherine Weinland, and Mark Gnatowski jointly and severally, in their private capacities as people, not as persons, and not by the public. We limit the imposition of said incarceration to Respondents Free and McCray at this time because of their active participation in acts of trespass, armed assault and battery, and contract breach, accompanied by drug abuse and child endangerment.

(b) Respondent Walker shall forthwith conduct a thorough search for an appropriate and immediate placement of Respondent Free's children during her incarceration, if at all possible, with a family member and shall report in writing on his efforts to this Court, notwithstanding that Respondent Walker's ostensible child protection duties are merely a façade to cover up his employer's true revenue generating functions. We shall maintain jurisdiction to appoint one or more of our members to supervise the appropriateness and safety of any such placement of Respondent Free's children. Respondents shall be liable for the supervisory services provided by this Court. Respondent Walker is specifically prohibited from placing said children with sex offenders or pedophiles, as it is common knowledge that Respondent Walker has a history of such conduct.

(c) Any further attempts by Respondents Street, Weinland, Gnatowski, their agents, principals or contractors to aid and abet Free or McCray in their acts of trespass, thievery, armed batteries, contract breach, drug abuse or child endangerment, or any further efforts to defy our INJUNCTION or other Orders, or to extort or coerce Claimants to do business with Respondents' corporate employer as legal fictions, may result in our extending of incarceration as a contempt sanction against them.

(d) Respondent Lavender, his agents, and contractors shall display no preferential treatment towards Respondents Free or McCray, during their incarceration and Respondent Lavender, his agents and contractors shall be subject to periodic unannounced investigations from OCCR members or their designees, in order to assess Respondents' compliance with our requirement of non-preferential incarceration of said Respondents Free and McCray.

(e) Respondents will be absolved of all further monetary liability, including all outstanding amounts billed, upon payment of all sums as required and defined herein and upon the actual termination of further acts of trespass, extortion, embezzlement, armed assault, armed battery, robbery, or conversion. Further violations of this Judgment shall be sanctioned even more harshly than we have done today. In particular, and as previously agreed by all Respondents, further acts of trespass to Claimants' God given rights and/or attempts to interfere with the August 11, 2023 contract between original Respondents and Claimants, carry financial charges in UNITED STATES dollars as follows:

- i. First trespass: Five Thousand UNITED STATES dollars, as defined hereinabove.
- ii. Second trespass: Fifty Thousand UNITED STATES dollars, as defined hereinabove.
- iii. Third trespass: Five Hundred Thousand UNITED STATES dollars, as defined hereinabove.

9. RESERVATION OF JURISDICTION: We hereby reserve jurisdiction for the purpose of adjudicating the criminal liabilities of the remaining named and unnamed Respondents, who are agents or contractors of any other named Respondent including without limitation Respondents Free, McCray, Street, Weinland, and Gnatowski. By declining to order the incarceration of the remaining Respondents at this time, including without limitation Respondent Eddy, we do not diminish the seriousness with which we view the involvement of said remaining Respondents, many of whom frequently and routinely participate in crimes of violence or threats of violence against the people of Ross County, Ohio, or the fact that they do so for financial compensation and/or for purposes of unholy idolatry to the Luciferian organizations by which all Supplemental Respondents admit that they are influenced. We shall address any still unresolved issues pertaining to the incarceration of the remaining Respondents, their agents, and contractors at such time as either of the following occurrences are brought to our attention by verified Notice:

- (a) any new or resumed threat against Claimants;
- (b) any act of interference with any of the provisions of this Judgment including without limitation,
 - (i) the people's confiscation of any firearms used by Respondents or their agents for corporate purposes, and/or
 - (ii) continuing incarceration of Respondents Free and/or McCray for the required term and according to the required conditions.

10. MEANS OF INVOKING OUR CONTINUING JURISDICTION: We further reserve jurisdiction to impose additional sanctions, including new liabilities and contempt sanctions, against Respondents, their agents, principals or contractors, or any other man or woman, whether or not claiming to act as a legal fiction "person", who may violate any of our Orders. We intend to proceed upon our receipt of any verified Notification reporting new or continuing instances of Respondents' threats of violence or other trespass against Claimants, either directly or indirectly, contrary to this Judgment and Order.

11. HOLDING HARMLESS: Respondents shall hold any of the people acting as Claimants' enforcement agents harmless for any acts performed for the purpose of, or incident to, the enforcement of any part of the Judgment herein or the August 11, 2023 Contract upon which it is based.

12. LOSS RECOUPMENT: Supplemental Respondents are hereby PROHIBITED from directly or indirectly seeking recoupment of losses incurred herein from the living men and women, if any, with whom they transact business or from members of the public at large. In the event that any Respondent ceases and desists in the ongoing interference with Claimants' right to contract, surrenders all offensive weapons on demand, and pays any outstanding Judgment, such facts will be taken into account in determining any future Respondent loss of liberty we may impose.


RESPONDENTS SHALL GOVERN THEMSELVES ACCORDINGLY.


Keith Belluardo

Keith Belluardo


By: Angela Plaster

Angela Plaster


By: Michael Plaster

Michael Plaster

Executed by us as Members of this Ohio Circuit Court of Record, assembled in the name and presence of our Savior Jesus Christ, on the date indicated hereinabove without the corporations known as UNITED STATES or STATE OF OHIO, their affiliates, subsidiaries, and/or parent corporations.