

Paul: Haley  
81/143 Hamilton Road  
Felixstowe  
Suffolk

By Recorded Delivery

Date: 6<sup>th</sup> February 2010

Andrea L Black  
P&ECD Casework & Specialist Advice  
D16, **DVLA**  
Longview Road  
Swansea  
SA6 7JL

Dear Andrea

**NOTICE of Understanding & Intent and Claim of Right:**

**Without Prejudice**

I am in receipt of your letter dated 27<sup>th</sup> January and note the contents.

This response is to remind you and once more give you and your organisation Notice as to why I have de-registered my car with you.

Whereas, on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2010, in the absence of specific, valid or appropriate contest forthcoming from DVLA to the specific understandings, intentions and claims made in the notices previously served on 25<sup>th</sup> November 2009 via Royal Mail, Recorded Delivery, the DVLA relinquished and waived all future rights to dispute the claims made by myself, and whereas my claim of right was established, permanent irrevocable 'issue estoppel' and 'equitable estoppel' were created, barring the bringing of charges against myself, Paul of the family Haley, a spiritual man, by any police officer, constable or prosecutor, and

Whereas I gave you Final Notice of this on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2010 via a final notice document signed by three witnesses, who verified the truth stated in that document by their signatures, and

Whereas you have now obliged me to write to you once more to respond to your claims and correct what I interpret to be some misinterpretations made by you and stated in your response of 27<sup>th</sup> January. I will address these individually:

**A. You stated “...you are obliged to comply with United Kingdom statute law...”**

1. I AM, notwithstanding my other documented grievances with 'The State',

and due to my current status as a Registered Citizen (pending my de-registration from said State's 'Society'), attempting to "...*comply with United Kingdom statute law...*" as you suggest I am obliged, even though the UK government, which I understand to in actual fact be Her Majesty's Government, i.e. working for 'The Crown' (a corporation sole and legal fiction) rather than The People (of whom it requires consent to be governed), is not setting an honourable example as it is not itself abiding by the very statute law it has created under the Roman system of Civil Law (even though in fact these Islands are a Common Law jurisdiction) and attempts to impose on the Citizens registered to it's 'Society'.

2. Unfortunately, as I pointed out to you via the Notices I addressed to your Chief Executive, the Crown's Government has broken it's own statute entitled '*The International Criminal Court Act 2001*' and other law including the Common Law and International Law, by committing acts of genocide and other war crimes against my fellows abroad, and I understand that if I pay tax I will be complicit in these crimes as Her Majesty's Treasury have informed me in writing that the vast majority of taxes collected by 'Her Majesty's' (The Crown's) government departments and agencies, including those levied by yourselves on behalf of The Secretary of State, are paid into what 'Her Majesty's Treasury' call '*The Consolidated Fund*' and therefore could be used by 'Her Majesty's Government' for their illegal wars and occupations without my consent.
3. The proof of this is given in Part I, 6.6 of the 'Vehicle Excise & Registration Act 1994', which states "*Vehicle excise duty, and any sums received by the Secretary of State by virtue of this Act by way of fees, shall be paid into the Consolidated Fund*"
4. And Part 5, 51 of the 'International Criminal Court Act 2001' states:

**51 Genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes**

- (1) It is an offence against the law of England and Wales for a person to commit genocide, a crime against humanity or a war crime.
- (2) This section applies to acts committed—
  - (a) in England or Wales, or
  - (b) outside the United Kingdom by a United Kingdom national, a United Kingdom resident or a person subject to UK service jurisdiction.

5. And Part 5, 52 of the 'International Criminal Court Act 2001' states:

## 52 Conduct ancillary to genocide, etc. committed outside jurisdiction

- (1) It is an offence against the law of England and Wales for a person to engage in conduct ancillary to an act to which this section applies.
- (2) This section applies to an act that if committed in England or Wales would constitute—
  - (a) an offence under section 51 (genocide, crime against humanity or war crime),  
or
  - (b) an offence under this section,but which, being committed (or intended to be committed) outside England and Wales, does not constitute such an offence.
- (3) The reference in subsection (1) to conduct ancillary to such an act is to conduct that would constitute an ancillary offence in relation to that act if the act were committed in England or Wales.
- (4) This section applies where the conduct in question consists of or includes an act committed—
  - (a) in England or Wales, or
  - (b) outside the United Kingdom by a United Kingdom national, a United Kingdom resident or a person subject to UK service jurisdiction.

I'm sure you must agree that this is very clear and put's all UK Registered Citizens, who pay tax and are as you state "...obliged to comply with *United Kingdom statute law...*" in a position where they are committing an offence under article 52 of *this* act.

6. So, said tax payers surely must *stop* paying tax so as *not* to commit an offence under this 'statute law'. This is my understanding and is, not withstanding my other documented grievances with 'The State', the reason why I have stopped paying any taxes which once collected are paid into the '*Consolidated Fund*'. If by doing this, you claim that I am in breach of other statutes then what am I to do? Which statute should take priority? Surely one or more of these statutes needs to be amended as there appears to be an enormous contradiction in place and a legal dilemma. What is a Citizen to do? How can he/she comply with two or more contradictory 'laws'? Please help if you can provide answers to these questions which I claim a right to in order that my Person remains lawful.

7. I would urge you, irrespective of your professional role as a civil servant, to investigate the ICC Act 2001 and the results of HM Government's and HM Armed Forces' actions in the Middle East yourself as I'm sure you will see, as I have, that the ICC Act 2001 has indeed been broken by your paymasters and that if you continue to pay taxes which arrive in the consolidated fund and therefore could be used to aid their crimes you are also committing an offence under this act.
8. Please advise, or perhaps request one of your agency's lawyers to advise; "How can I lawfully abide by two or more conflicting statutory obligations?" As stated above, I claim a right to this information. In the meantime in its absence, I have assumed that it is more morally just to withhold tax and face potential financial penalties for a minor civil misdemeanour (whilst I am still a Registered Citizen) rather than pay tax and be responsible for conduct ancillary to war crimes committed by The Crown and it's Government which have directly and indirectly resulted in the deaths of over 1 MILLION of our fellow men, women and children.
9. According to Part IV 56.(3) of the '*Vehicle Excise & Registration Act 1994*' any financial penalties collected are also paid into the '*Consolidated Fund*' so if we reach the stage where my Person is penalised under this 'Act' for trying to comply with another (i.e. the ICC Act 2001) then I will not, unless you can advise otherwise, lawfully be able to pay such penalties on behalf of my Person as these funds could also be used for military purposes and again cause my Person to commit an offence ancillary to the war crimes mentioned in 4. and 5. above.

**B. You stated "I interpret your letter to imply that you refute any such obligation <to comply with statute law>..."**

10. Your interpretation is not correct as I have made clear in points 1. to 8. above. I understand that whilst I have a 'Person' registered as a Member of The State's Society, that Person (a legal fiction) acts in commerce and can accordingly have claims made against it and is obliged to comply with the statutes of the Society that it is registered to i.e. the 'UNITED KINGDOM'.
11. If you undertake research you will see that a 'Society' can be defined in Legalese as "*...an association or company of persons united by mutual consent, to deliberate, determine, and act jointly for a common purpose...*" (Blacks Law Dictionary) rather than in English as "*...a group of people forming a single community with its own distinctive culture and institutions...*" As a man I use the English definition, whereas I interpret my 'Person' to be subject to the Legalese definition and therefore the Society requires my consent to retain Membership of my Person and to be bound by its statutes. But as a man I am always bound by the Common Law and

so will never commit a criminal act without just fear of reprisal.

12. As statutes are legal documents they are written in Legalese (as confirmed by Collins English Dictionary where it defines Legalese as “*the conventional language in which legal documents are written*”) and as they always refer to obligations of 'Persons' rather than 'people' I have interpreted this to mean that the former Legalese definition of Society quoted above applies, rather than the latter English one and therefore whilst I have a Person which is a registered Member of the UK Society I am attempting to ensure that Person complies with the Society's statutes, but find it cannot due to the conflicting instructions I refer to in A. above
13. If a free man wishes to de-register his Person from Membership of a Society then he will no longer be bound by its statutes, but although imminent I am not at that stage as yet and desire The State to prove it is honourable by complying with its own statutory legislation. If it does not, then I will, and for reason of the other grievances given in my first Notice, and many more, de-register my Person from the UK Society as it will no longer enjoy my 'mutual consent'.

**C. You stated “I will not engage in any discussion on this matter...”**

14. But, then you proceeded to engage in discussion, so as I have made clear I am obliged to respond to put on record the correct and intended interpretation of my Notices to you. I am an honourable man and am not a criminal.

**D. You referred to some statutory obligations and stated “*There are penalties provided for in statute law for breach of these obligations.*”**

15. I am aware of the statutory penalties under Part III of the '*Vehicle Excise & Registration Act 1994*' applicable to 'Persons' for breach of obligations (being obligations imposed by the State on Persons which are Registered Members of the UK Society, via it's Civil Legal System of Acts & Statutes). However, the payment of these would fall into the same legal dilemma, as covered in 9. above. Again, I claim that I require a suitably qualified representative of your agency, or the Secretary of State by whom you are engaged, or HM Government's Attorney General to explain how both statutes mentioned in this Notice can lawfully be adhered to.
16. I can assure you that I do not wish to cause you, your agency or any of my fellows distress by my actions, nor do I wish to have to write Notices and letters to state my case but feel morally compelled to ask these questions in order to remain lawful.
17. My car will be maintained in a safe and roadworthy manner and I and any

other travellers manoeuvring it will be insured to do so in some appropriate way. I also still hold a license on behalf of, and in the name of my Person (although as a man under Common Law I do not use my car for commercial gain and therefore do not require a license) but am happy at any stage to prove my ability to manoeuvre my car safely as I will not knowingly put any of my fellows at risk.

18. Having already had roadside discussions about this matter with a Police Officer, (who's only requirement of course is to prevent crime and protect the people) I have confirmed that my actions are honourable under the Common Law as I am not putting my fellows that live on this land at risk of injury or harm, loss or damage and am not acting fraudulently towards them by not paying tax, which I only do at present in order to remain honourable under Common Law to my other fellows abroad and so as not to breach the ICC Act 2001 as advised. I am ready if necessary to discuss the State's legal dilemma and statutory conflict in this matter with any appropriate representative of The State or its 'Justice System'. Police Officers operate to prevent crime

**E. And, I finally note that in your last paragraph you again state that you *“...will not enter into any further discussion on the matter...”***

19. So I do not expect further DVLA or Department of Transport correspondence unless it is to provide the information I have claimed a right to in this Notice, and in the absence of this, or any further correspondence by way of counter claims I will interpret this to mean that we have tacit agreement to the correct interpretations of my Notices and the legitimacy of the rights I claim here.

I write in such clear and stark terms in order to avoid any doubt.

### **Addressing of Further Correspondence**

Previous details given for the correct addressing of any correspondence by way of reply, and the treatment of any such replies, also apply here. Accordingly, if you wish me to open, read and/or act upon ANY communications regarding any of my Notices or my private conveyance they must be addressed to me the man 'Paul: Haley' (or 'Paul of the family Haley').

If your DVLA computer system cannot handle a colon in the given name or family name fields (i.e. the registered first name & surname of the legal fiction) but provides for a middle name then you may use the middle name field on your database for either the colon or the phrase which it represents, viz. “of the family”. Your letters Andrea have been correctly addressed and so I have dealt with them, but if your agency is attempting to deliver other incorrectly addressed correspondence I regret it will not be delivered and therefore it will not be dealt

with.

Again, I write in such clear and stark terms in order to avoid any doubt.

Notice to agent is notice to principle and vice versa.

Faithfully in honour, with respect for all the war dead and without prejudice

**Paul: Haley**

I Reserve All My Rights And Waive None.