

***This is BlueLotusTravelers© Treatise on the writing that has been passed along titled,  
“WHAT REALLY HAPPENS IN COURT?”  
>>>>>>EXPANDED for Better understanding.<<<<<<<***

**How to read this for comprehension:** All that is in blue and Red are my comments and analysis as to what I understand from what was put forth by the originator's of the original writing all in Black. I changed nothing of his/her words. Except maybe some highlighting, bolding or italicizing the copy for emphasis.

My object was to break down the linear story that is being told to where the reader could grasp the significance and titles of the players and rolls of action that are put in motion by this “Banking” process. But Also, Thou should take notice of my imposing the significance that I believe thee should seriously be aware of in recognizing how these bastions of tricksters get “YOU” and “YOUR” acceptance and permission to accept their jurisdiction and agreement to be the “fall-guy” to be the surety.

→ I suggest that before thou reads this treatise that thou read the “**Achillies Heel is YOU**”<sup>\*</sup> first. Truly embrace this insight and then this treatise will have even greater benefit in evolving thine way of thinking and hearing or listening for the Tricks being played.

(\* Available on [www.myprivateaudio.com](http://www.myprivateaudio.com) Look in guest speakers for BlueLotusTraveler©)

---

FYI ONLY...your own due diligence is a must...this does seem to explain EXACTLY what is going on in the courtroom...

Did you know that an arrest warrant and a summons are vouchers seeking a bank's consent to transfer Estate (private) funds to the Court's depository account to pay for the Case Bond?

**(FIRST)** Let's **examine a standard check deposit** at BofA. The bank endorses the check PAY TO THE ORDER OF BANK OF AMERICA, which is a banker's acceptance by the Payee's bank that monetizes the instrument (converts it to money of account).

This means in lay-mans terms:

1. The real-man gets a check made out to him **the payee** from **anyone the payer**.
2. He deposits the check into his account by endorsement, Now it's the banks check
3. The bank takes that check and does a secondary endorsement, *(like they don't want anyone else to do because it causes a lag in them getting the funds, not identity theft)* this is the stealing of the note claiming title to the funds and issues “credits” to your account . 3b.This is the stage they do a little gambling. They “allow” a portion of the depositors funds (yours) to be given back in FRNs in hope that the Check “Clears”. Meaning that your bank will get the money from the bank that you where given the check from.

BofA then steals title to the funds by issuing credits to the depositor's account (a general account)<sup>3</sup>.

It places a hold on the credits<sup>3b</sup> and forwards the check to the Payer's (That being from whom gave you the check) bank for authorization to release the hold<sup>4</sup>.

4. But if you've a history of depositing bad checks they won't.

If funds are available, the Payer's bank (where you got the check from) will endorse the check (yet another banker's acceptance) and return it to its customer, the Payer (at least they used

to). If funds are insufficient, BofA will cancel it's endorsement and RETURN THE CHECK TO THE DEPOSITOR/PAYEE.

4. This title to the funds the depositor (you) put into your account Notice, the credits move to the Payee and the security moves back to the issuer who issued the security. You can always return to this transaction to understand most any event in the world around you.

### **(SECOND, a comparison)**

**For instance, a case in an incorporated Court...**

The Court (JUDGE) deposits the Indictment by endorsing it "FILED IN CASE NO. 1:10-CR-123456." (here the judge is actually acting as though he's got a check to deposit. Such as YOU) THE STAMP IS A BANKER'S ACCEPTANCE.

- Doesn't it signify acceptance, opening of an account, issuance of a number, and a deposit?
- Doesn't the (an) indictment have a Payer (strawman) (that would be YOU), Payee (Plaintiff), (an) implied amount (penal sum on the charges), a date, signature, and place of payment (the Court)?
- Doesn't the Court maintain securities accounts in its normal course of business, making it a securities intermediary per UCC 8-102(angel)? What else could it be if not a banker's acceptance?

By the way, the Clerk is a pimp (to quote Vito Corleone). The Clerk is a bank teller acting for the Court. The concept that the Clerk is the Court is one of our patriot misconceptions.

- After depositing "the check" (Elvick, Shroul, Kennedy and Smith were on the money), the
  - Court then issues credits to a general account, meaning it steals title to the deposit (to the funds - see my last posting) ON THE PRESUMPTION that the funds will eventually be made available by the Payer. (Just like above in 3b)
- They ALWAYS presume the funds will be available until proven otherwise by an NSF (non-sufficient Funds) notice from the Payer's bank. Then, just like BofA,
- the Court issues a voucher to the Payer's bank to certify the existence of the book-entry credits - the funds.

Regarding Court, THE VOUCHER IS THE BENCH WARRANT OR SUMMONS. These are nothing more than securities issued to secure acceptance by the Payer's bank - indorsement. That's all that's going on. It's well disguised of course. For the masses at large, the transaction is disguised as law.

For lawyers, it's disguised as equity - a violation of a presumed contract to comply with statues. To patriots, it's disguised as an admiralty arrest of the vessel as Jack Smith taught for years to get the creditor to appear and post bond. But the core issue - the real issue at work - *the underlying issue that controls your life is that they are seeking authorization by the Payer's bank (you) to establish the Payer as surety on the account.* Who's the Payer? THE ESTATE of course.

***They are seeking your consent to ESTABLISH THE ESTATE AS SURETY*** for the funds credited to the account represented by the Case Number...

**Here the "estate" is the joinder of the PERSON and the decedent. And when YOU**

answers to the Summons or Warrant the COURT/BANK they has got their acceptance from **YOU** to honor the payment.

Meaning, AS SURETY FOR THE CASE BOND they already issued.

I repeat...FOR THE CASE BOND which they already issued on the PRESUMPTION that the funds WOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE, when **YOU** appeared physically, hired a lawyer to appear, gave your name, sent in a motion (which creates a general appearance even if you protest jurisdiction), or just entered the Courtroom and said "I'm here on that matter."

Read the definition of Bond in 48 CFR 28.001. A bond is a two party pledge to the Government in which a principal (the strawman)(The PERSON) + a **Decedent** , that being **YOU (Accept to be )** surety = (the Estate) guarantee an obligation to perform.

All they want is the Estate (**YOU**) to step forward and ACCEPT liability as SURETY to fund the securities account identified by the Case Number.

### **BANKER'S ACCEPTANCE.**

The concept that they just reach into the Estate any time they want and take the funds misconception. Yes, THE BC IS A PRESUMPTION OF THE ESTATE'S AGREEMENT TO ACT AS SURETY. But just like a bank check, they MUST go back to the source and have the security approved.

They MUST get your SPECIFIC consent to have the Estate act as surety on the Bond (the Case Bond). They MUST get YOUR banker's acceptance. Any time you want to understand the public system, JUST DIAGRAM HOW THEY PROCESS A SIMPLE BANK CHECK. SO what you have is the Court issuing CREDITS TO A GENERAL ACCOUNT (stealing title), a securities account represented by the Case Number under the PRESUMPTION that the Payer's bank will authorize the funding on behalf of its client, the Estate, the presumed surety.

### **How do they secure the Estate's consent?**

THE APPEARANCE BOND. The appearance bond is your BANKER'S ACCEPTANCE of the arrest warrant voucher. Make no mistake about it - **YOU ARE THE BANKER**. They are seeking **YOUR** INDORSEMENT - your BANKER'S ACCEPTANCE - the authorization to presume the Estate is the surety on the Case Bond.

**If you decline, if you tell them "the Estate" does not consent to act as surety on the bond," then they have a huge problem.**

Like any depository institution, they can either:

1. Recall the Case Bond, cancel their indorsement on the Indictment/Complaint security, and return it to the prosecutor/plaintiff's attorney marked NSF (insufficient funds), or
2. They can ACCEPT LIABILITY AS SURETY FOR THE CASE BOND. Meaning, the public trust known as JUDGE X, the gambler that issued the Case Bond on the presumption that the Payer (the Estate) would agree to convey its credit, is the only possible source of the funds.

**This is why they will resort to shameless incivility to get the appearance bond. They don't want to be stuck with the liability. Because when they steal the Estate's equity by depositing the Indictment security generally, they have terminated your interest in it and they become liable for the income and capital gains taxes on the taxable termination (26**

**USC 2612, 2603).**

When **YOU sign the Appearance Bond in admiralty**, the creditor is agreeing to provide the real property (your body) as security.

THIS IS WHY TIM TURNER'S DEBTOR/CREDITOR RELATIONSHIP IS A TRAVESTY.

**>The desired relationship, Trustee (them) / Beneficiary (us) is where we can hold them accountable for breach of trust.**

When **YOU sign the Appearance Bond in equity**, you are agreeing to MAKE A GENERAL APPEARANCE as the Defendant in a corporate Court of inferior statutory law.

Which means, **you** have also CONSENTED TO THE ORIGINAL GENERAL DEPOSIT. **You** have consented to the transfer of private funds to the public side of the ledger for deposit to a general account under their control (legal title), rather than a special deposit under your control.

THIS IS HOW THEY TAP THE ESTATE, and not by some backroom grab.

**The Arrest Warrant is the voucher to secure that acceptance.** Nothing more.>>

What would happen if the Appearance Bond was noted with a banker's acceptance and the reverse side was indorsed: "FOR SPECIAL DEPOSIT ONLY TO ACCOUNT NO. 1:10-CR-123456 FOR RELEASE OF REAL PROPERTY." And one added: "NOT FOR GENERAL DEPOSIT OR REISSUE OF SECURITIES. SEE JUDGE X FOR PAYMENT OF BOND NO. 1:10-CR-123456."

**(this is)** Definitely NOT recommending this to ANYONE.

Does anyone still think that UNDERSTANDING is **not** your ticket out?

**SO, This is the BlueLotusTravelers approach...**

- 1. NEVER EVER Answer to respond to ANY offer directed to "YOU" to do anything nor admit to such as " Are YOU the name"**
- 2. NO MATTER WHAT, NEVER SIGN 1 damn Thing, Nothing! (that is unless it is ... "without prejudice , UCC 1-207/308" then ONLY with thine first name. (if thee uses thine last name then Thine will be considered the Decedent as they presume. If thine is asked , " is this 'YOUR' signature", I would respond "well, "I" don't know whom "YOUR" is!**
- 3. ALWAYS enter into the record that "I" do NOT Understand, I DO NOT accept and I DO NOT consent to anything their administrative Corporation has to offer.**
- 4. I do NOT recognize this meeting as a court of LAW.**

**And walk OUT.**

**In conclusion: GET THIS IN this In thine head NEVER RESPOND to the word "YOU"**

**Listen for it , Question it , but NEVER ANSWER to "YOU" or "YOUR"**

*NOTICE: This is not legal advise and is not intended for anything other than an excisein critical thinking for the benefit of the readers to gain control of their abilities to be in control of their abilities in dealing with Con-artists of the Commercial systems which they all are.*

*I'd like to thank the originator of the originator of the Titled writing but I know not who to address to do so. BlueLotusTraveler©*