

office given to sheriffs, sergeants, and barristers at law, justices of the peace, and others. 1 BL. Comm. 406; 3 Steph. Comm. 15, note; Tomlins.”

42. The reason this definition stated “In English law is because the United States of America and the several states were not permitted by the Constitution for the United States of America in two places to grant title of nobility. Additionally, the original 13<sup>th</sup> Article of Amendment disallowed anyone with a title of nobility from serving in public office. This amendment has never been repealed. The 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment also revokes the citizenship of anyone who accepts a title of nobility how accepts one from a foreign power.
43. The second definition included in Black’s law 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, was added later in conspiracy to allow these foreign agents to infiltrate the government at all levels. However, one cannot simply change a definition to suit ones needs. This tactic would nullify any and all Constitutions since anyone who assumes power could merely redefine words in the constitution to suit his needs.
44. This is not the only time that definitions have been changed to suit the needs of the foreign agent BAR members. The definition of court of record was also changed in the 5<sup>th</sup> edition of Black’s Law Dictionary to strip out the two criteria that bound the hands of the foreign agent BAR members from practicing total control over the court system and rewriting law to strip the freedoms of Americans and ignore the Constitution of the United States of America and even the Nevada Constitution which also requires the courts to be courts of record. The two critical requirements the foreign agent BAR members were attempting to hide were;

A. A judicial tribunal having attributes and exercising functions independently of the person of the magistrate designated generally to hold it [Jones v. Jones, 188 Mo.App. 220, 175 S.W. 227, 229; Ex parte Gladhill, 8 Metc. Mass., 171, per Shaw, C.J. See, also, Ledwith v. Rosalsky, 244 N.Y. 406, 155 N.E. 688, 689][Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Ed., 425, 426]

B. Proceeding according to the course of common law [Jones v. Jones, 188 Mo.App. 220, 175 S.W. 227, 229; Ex parte Gladhill, 8 Metc. Mass., 171, per Shaw, C.J. See, also, Ledwith v. Rosalsky, 244 N.Y. 406, 155 N.E. 688, 689][Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Ed., 425, 426]

45. All of the changes to these definitions occurred after the formation of the America BAR Association in 1978.

46. This conspiracy can be considered nothing less than treason to overthrow the United States of America under the control of a foreign power. Judges have even become so brazen they admit in court their loyalty and the fact that their orders come from the crown of England, knowing that nobody will do anything to stop them.

47. This conspiracy has caused claimant to be held in jail in Utah due to the defiance of the counterdefendants against the orders of this court of record that even the highest court, other than this court, has opined it does not have the authority to question. The Supreme Court of the United States refuses to question the orders of a court of record, but the counterdefendants act as though they are superior to the SCOTUS by ignoring the orders of this court.

48. It is settled in law that attorneys are mere BAR card carrying members. A BAR card is not a license to practice law. It is not like a license to practice medicine, to be a chiropractor, to build a house and other licenses. There is no law that states that a BAR card is equal or IS a

license. BAR members are members of a private association much like the association Sam's Club that many people are a member of, except that it is a foreign private association.

49. As a member of the corporation State Bar of Nevada DUNS# 79-300-0142, none of the foreign agents BAR members have a stake in this matter, save that of making an income from "representing" a client, who is considered "Ward<sup>9</sup> of the court"<sup>10</sup>.

50. There is no Legislative Authority for the International B.A.R., or the American B.A.R., the British Accreditation Registry, to be created. Nor is there authority to work in the courts, and to monopolize the courts. BAR members issue their own union cards, deceptively leading the people to believe they are "Licenses." Imagine a private Carpenter's Union issuing their own licenses. This type of monopoly is against the Taft-Hartley Act, The Clayton Trust Act, the Sherman Antitrust Act, and the Smith Act. Bar members are a SELF-APPOINTED monopoly.

51. This is the People's court of record and it does not have to put up with foreign agents, attorneys, that have no desire to see real law at work and true justice served. They merely argue statutes that do not apply to the People and have no concept of inherent rights and laws. Each of the counterdefendants are harming the claimant and have bullied their way into a situation they had no business in. They are in dishonor in helping State of Nevada, a corporation, a non-people, steal private property from a natural private man.

52. Just as attorneys can't see real people in their inferior court, so too people can't see attorneys, foreign agents, in this court of record. Attorneys never deal with the original laws inherent to

---

<sup>9</sup> **Wards of the court** - infants and persons of unsound mind placed by the court under the care of a guardian. (**Davis Committee v. Loney**, 290 Ky. 644, 162 S.W.2d. 189, 190)

<sup>10</sup> Corpus Juris Secundum, Volume 7



man. They argue statutes that serve the corporations interest. No corporation creates itself.

Only man creates. Man can also destroy corporations.

53. All of the counterdefendants have been afforded time to provide just cause why the orders of this court were invalid and none have done so. "Failure to object, means you agree."

### **III. Ruling on Action**

54. THE COURT, HAVING REVIEWED THE FACTS, THE RECORD, AND finding that the counterdefendants have failed to rebut the allegations set forth in the above title action at law in this court of record;

55. And, desiring that fair justice be served for all parties, defendants, as well as claimants,

56. FOR THE ABOVE STATED REASONS THE COURT FINDS to wit:

57. FOR ALL CAUSES OF ACTION, THE COURT finds that defendants State of Nevada, City of Las Vegas and Clark County did not knowingly participate in the injuries against counterclaimant. The court recognizes that the government agencies and their corporations depend on the hiring of agents who they expect to abide to the confines of the statutes published for said agents. And while the court recognizes these statutes are foreign to this court, the government agents are expected to abide by them. As such, the monetary damages awarded to counterclaimant in these actions are to paid by the counterdefendants Kenneth Mead, Douglas Gillespie, D. King, Michael Madland, B. Vanossbree, S. Jung, FBI Agents 1 through 40, LVPD Police 1 through 30, Clark County Sheriff Department, Department of the Treasury Doe 1, Department of the Treasury Doe 2, Ewing Brothers Towing Company Inc., Las Vegas Review Journal, and Eli Segall, Fox5 KVVU Broadcasting Corporation and United States INC.

58. IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED THAT counterdefendants are permanently enjoin from interfering in counterclaimant Benson's right to free movement.
59. FOR THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION THE COURT FINDS in favor of counterclaimant and hereby orders counterdefendants to pay to counterclaimant \$50,000.00.
60. FOR THE SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION THE COURT FINDS in favor of counterclaimant and hereby orders counterdefendants to pay to counterclaimant \$25,000.00.
61. FOR THE THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION THE COURT FINDS in favor of counterclaimant and hereby orders counterdefendant Las Vegas Review Journal and Eli Segall to pay to counterclaimant \$1,800,000.00 (dollars) and an article published above the fold in defendants primary periodical approved by claimant and/or claimant's advisers retracting counterdefendants' defamatory comments and including counterclaimant's side of the story. Lacking publication of said article within three weeks of the judgment of this court, counterdefendants Journal and Segall are ordered to each pay to claimant an additional \$50,000.00 (dollars) each week the article goes unpublished until such time as the article is published.
62. FOR THE FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION THE COURT FINDS in favor of counterclaimant and hereby orders counterdefendants to pay to counterclaimant \$2,300,000.00.
63. FOR THE FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION THE COURT FINDS in favor of counterclaimant and hereby orders counterdefendants to pay to counterclaimant \$15,000.00.
64. FOR THE SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION THE COURT FINDS in favor of counterclaimant and hereby orders counterdefendants to pay to counterclaimant \$1,200,000.00.