<<YOUR ADDRESS>>

<<CITY>>, <<STATE>> <<ZIP>>

Email: <<YOUR EMAIL>>

<<DATE>>

<<COURT REPORTER NAME>>

<<COURT REPORTER ADDRESS>>

<<CITY>>, <<STATE>> <<ZIP>>

Phone: <<PHONE>>

Enclosures:

(1) DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT ERRATA AND CHANGES

(2) DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT SUBMITTED BY DEPONENT DURING DEPOSITION (see item #9 in Enclosure #1).

(3) AFFIRMATION OF DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT

Dear Sir,

This correspondence shall constitute a formal list of errata and corrections for the deposition indicated in Encl. (1). It shall also constitute a resubmission of information that was criminally and illegally omitted from the deposition materials by the Court Reporter, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §1622 and 18 U.S.C. §1512. Please kindly add Enclosure (2), which was also submitted to you during the deposition or be guilty of subornation of perjury and witness tampering.

I also believe the court reporter committed perjury on her affirmation at the end of the transcript with the following statement:

“I do further certify that I am a disinterested person and am in no way interested in the outcome of this action or connected with or related to any of the parties in this action to their respective counsel.”

This is a flat out deception. To that statement I request that the Court Reporter, Ms. <<COURT REPORTER NAME>>, answer the following questions and provide her answers with the final deposition transcript:

1. Admit that you submit IRS 1040 returns annually for you or on behalf of you or your spouse.

YOUR ANSWER: \_\_\_\_Admit \_\_\_\_Deny

1. Admit that as a “taxpayer” who files IRS 1040 returns, you are a public “employee” engaged in a “trade or business”. If you are disagree, please read the following and answer the rebut the admissions at the end:

<http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/TradeOrBusScam.pdf>

YOUR ANSWER: \_\_\_\_Admit \_\_\_\_Deny

1. Admit that you are or will eventually be collecting retirement benefits derived from Social Security, Medicare, FICA, or other federal benefit.

YOUR ANSWER: \_\_\_\_Admit \_\_\_\_Deny

1. Admit that the currency that is or will be used to pay your present or future federal benefits in the previous question derive from the alleged “taxes” at issue in this proceeding.

YOUR ANSWER: \_\_\_\_Admit \_\_\_\_Deny

1. Admit that the currency used to pay for your services in the course of this proceeding derived from the alleged “taxes” in question.

YOUR ANSWER: \_\_\_\_Admit \_\_\_\_Deny

1. Admit that if the Deponent wins this case, your present or future benefits could be reduced or eliminated or jeopardized.

YOUR ANSWER: \_\_\_\_Admit \_\_\_\_Deny

1. Admit that it is a conflict of interest for you to have any financial interest in the outcome of this proceeding, and constitutes a violation of 18 U.S.C. §208 if you are a federal “employee”.

YOUR ANSWER: \_\_\_\_Admit \_\_\_\_Deny

1. Admit that as a “taxpayer” who files IRS form 1040, you are a federal “employee”. If you are disagree, please read the following and rebut the admissions at the end:

<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/WhyThiefOrPubOfficer.pdf>

YOUR ANSWER: \_\_\_\_Admit \_\_\_\_Deny

Thank you for prompt your attention to this matter and your respect for a disinterested, impartial judicial decision process free of biased witnesses, judges, U.S. Attorneys, evidence, and Court Reporting.

Sincerely,

C. Hansen

(NOT “CHRISTOPHER M. HANSEN” or “DEFENDANT”)

cc: <<OPPOSING COUNSEL NAME>>; <<OPPOSING COUNSEL ADDRESS>>; <<CITY>>, <<STATE>> <<ZIP>>; Phone: <<PHONE>>

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED that service of the foregoing, and all attached exhibits has been made upon the following addressee by depositing a copy in the United States mail, postage prepaid, this \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_\_\_ addressed to:

<<OPPOSING COUNSEL NAME>>

<<OPPOSING COUNSEL ADDRESS>>

<<CITY>>, <<STATE>> <<ZIP>>

I furthermore certify that:

1. I am at least 18 years of age
2. I am not related to either party to this legal proceeding by blood, marriage, adoption, or employment
3. I serve as a “disinterested third party” to this action
4. That I am in no way connected to, or involved in or with, the person and/or matter at issue in this instant action.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_SignaturePrinted Name:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date |

**ENCLOSURE 1: DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT REQUESTED CHANGES**

This exhibit lists all the errors, omissions, and inaccuracies in the typing of the court reporter, Ms. <<COURT REPORTER NAME>>.

# *DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT ERRATA AND CHANGES*

| Submitted by: | <<YOUR NAME>>Deponent (Who is NOT the Defendant, but the Deponent) |
| --- | --- |
| Date Submitted: |  |
| Date/place of Deposition: |  |
| ***#*** | ***PAGE/LINE*** | ***FROM*** | ***TO*** | ***NOTES*** |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Witness Signature, Duress Date

**ENCLOSURE 2: DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT SUBMITTED BY DEPONENT DURING DEPOSITION**

This deposition transcript was prepared and submitted by the Deponent, as indicated in Enclosure (1), Item #9 above and as documented in the deposition transcript itself on p. 141.

**ENCLOSURE 3: AFFIRMATION OF DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT**

I, “<<YOUR NAME>>”, and NOT “<<ALLL CAPS NAME>>” or the “DEFENDANT”, do hereby declare that:

1. I have read the foregoing transcript; that I have made such corrections as noted herein, in ink, initialed by me, or attached hereto.
2. That I am not the Defendant in this proceeding, and that the deposing Counsel is the Defendant based on his use of copyrighted and licensed information subject to the Member Agreement that he became subject to by virtue of downloading and using the website the dispenses said protected materials.
3. That I am incapable of signing this document voluntarily or giving consent absent unlawful duress.
4. That the testimony contained herein, as corrected was coerced under unlawful, willful, flagrant duress, and without consent. The source of the duress is the Deposing Counsel and the Magistrate Judge. All just powers derive from the Consent of the governed, according to the Declaration of Independence, and no consent has ever been or will be provided by Deponent. Therefore, all powers exercised by this court must be exercised by comity and can derive from no other source in the case of a nonresident deponent.
5. That I appeared at the deposition in the capacity of a compelled public employee, who is the only proper subject of this proceeding. See: <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/WhyThiefOrPubOfficer.pdf>
6. That all questions answered related exclusively to my activities as a compelled public “employee”.
7. That because my presence as a nonresident deponent was unlawfully compelled, it continues to be unreliable, untrustworthy, and inadmissible in this or in any other proceeding unless and until *all* sources of unlawful duress documented in the Affidavit of Duress appearing in Exhibit 2 of the Deposition Transcript, entitled “Deposition Handout” are carefully acknowledged, remedied, and removed by the Court. The ONLY function of the court is to preserve the requirement for consent in ALL human interactions, and there is no consent here and never has been any consent on the part of the falsely accused, from the very beginning of this proceeding. In fact, the Court has maliciously and willfully undermined those aspects of the proceeding that *did* involve consent by interfering with voluntary contracts such as the Member Agreements in question. In that sense, it appears to be conducting a covert war against self-government in favor of expanding its unlawful corporation monopoly upon “protection”.

I certify that the Deposition Transcript will be viewed or interpreted by the finder of fact as false, wrong, and misleading if any of the enclosures or this document in its entirety are not included with the final Deposition Transcript, and will thereby produce the following types of injustice, prejudice, and violation of the Constitution and enacted positive law:

1. Prejudice to Constitutionally guaranteed rights caused by false presumption. The following types of false presumptions which will operate to prejudice constitutionally protected rights:

(1) [8:4993] **Conclusive presumptions affecting protected interests:**  A conclusive presumption may be defeated where its application would impair a party's constitutionally-protected liberty or property interests.  In such cases, conclusive presumptions have been held to violate a party's due process and equal protection rights.  [Vlandis v. Kline (1973) [412 U.S. 441](http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?navby=case&court=us&vol=412&page=441), 449, 93 S.Ct 2230, 2235; Cleveland Bed. of Ed. v. LaFleur (1974) [414 US 632](http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?navby=case&court=us&vol=414&page=632), 639-640, 94 S.Ct. 1208, 1215-presumption under Illinois law that unmarried fathers are unfit violates process]

**[**[**Rutter Group Practice Guide-Federal Civil Trials and Evidence, paragraph 8:4993, page 8K-34**](http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/Presumption-RPG-Federal.pdf)**]**

* 1. False presumption that the Deponent manifested a physical presence at the deposition consensually and voluntarily.
	2. False presumption that testimony or any other aspect of compelled “cooperation” was given consensually, voluntarily, or freely. The Court hearing this proceeding admitted in its ruling, Docket #33, p. 3 that consent is required, Dunes at Monterey, Ltd., 526 US. 687, 707 (1999).. Deponent has at no time ever given his consent to any pert of this proceeding. He has signed very pleading under duress, has never made an “appearance”, has qualified his penalty of perjury statements to put himself outside of the jurisdiction of the court, and maintains his status as a “nonresident defendant” who has not surrendered his sovereign immunity under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. §1605. The court continues to engaged in extortion under the color of law against him, continues to fail to recognized this limits on its authority, continues to cite irrelevant caselaw not from the domicile of the Deponent, and continues to fail to recognize the obligation created by the oath of its officers and employees.
	3. False presumption about the definition or significance of the words used by the Deponent. The First Amendment guarantees us a right to communicate freely with our government. That right BEGINS with the right to defined the meaning of the words we use. The Court Reporter has denied the exercise of that Constitutionally protected right by denying the Deponent the ability to submit evidence during the deposition which defines the meaning of the words he and the deposing counsel were using. This is especially important, because the deposing counsel chronically and repeated refused to provide a legal definition for the words he was using and even requested that the deponent provide a definition. When the Deponent finally attempted to define the words by submitting Enclosure (2) during the Deposition, the Deposing Counsel tried to censor that effort by destroying and omitting the evidence submitted and thereby prejudicing the rights of the deponent in violation of 18 U.S.C. §1622 and 18 U.S.C. §1512.
	4. False presumption about the meaning or definition attributed by the Deponent to the statements of the deposing counsel.
	5. False presumption that this is a lawful proceeding undertaken with the authority of enacted positive law, and implementing regulations published in the Federal Register as required by the Federal Register Act, 44 U.S.C. §1505(a)(1) and the Administrative Procedures Act, 5 U.S.C. §553(a).
	6. False presumption that the evidence produced by this deposition is admissible. In fact, it was given under unlawful duress, and the Magistrate Judge exceeded her authority and violated her oath of office in willfully and knowingly 1. Ordering the deponent to violate his sincerely held religious conviction prohibiting taking of oaths; 2. Violating a contract clearly explained and expressed, in violation of the Constitution, Article 1, Section 10, prohibiting states, and in violation of the Sinking Fund Cases, both of which prohibit any government official from interfering with the right to contract.
	7. False presumption that the Deponent is receiving equal protection of the law by this court when in fact he is not.
1. Compelled association in violation of the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America. Deponent does not wish to be compelled to do business with, maintain a domicile within, or to maintain any legal relationship with the United States government, a federal corporate monopoly which is focused on destroying, and not protecting Constitutional rights.
2. Unnecessary and unwarranted violation of the Fourth Amendment right to privacy. The only way that violation of this or any other right is the violation of the equal rights of others, and there are no others. Therefore, Plaintiff is willfully violating the Constitution and its officers are violating their oath to support and defend the Constitution.

"Of liberty I would say that, in the whole plenitude of its extent, it is unobstructed action according to our will. But rightful liberty is unobstructed action according to our will within limits drawn around us by the equal rights of others. I do not add 'within the limits of the law,' because law is often but the tyrant's will, and always so when it violates the right of an individual." --Thomas Jefferson to Isaac H. Tiffany, 1819

Finally, I declare that this perjury statement and the truthfulness or accuracy of any of the statements of the deponent may only be enforced, and will only be viewed as truthful or accurate, and not misleading within the following venue, which is the only venue to which deponent will consent as a consequence of his domicile as declared in his answer.

1. Jury trial in a state court.
2. No jurist or judge may be a “U.S. citizen” under 8 U.S.C. §1401, or a “taxpayer” under 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14).
3. No jurist or judge, like the Deponent, may be in receipt of any federal financial or other benefit or employment nor maintain a domicile on federal property or territory.
4. The common law of the state and no federal law or act of Congress or the Internal Revenue Code are the rules of decision, as required Fed.R.Civ.P. Rule 17(b), 28 U.S.C. §1652, Erie RR v. Tompkins, [304 U.S. 64](http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?navby=case&court=us&vol=304&page=64) (1938).
5. Any judge who receives retirement or employment benefits derived from Subtitle A of the I.R.C. recuse himself in judging the law and defer to the jury instead, as required under 18 U.S.C. §208, 28 U.S.C. §144, and 28 U.S.C. §455.
6. Law applied derives from the domicile of the Deponent, which means the Holy Bible, because his domicile if Heaven and no place on earth. He does not give his consent to be bound by any law or to have any domicile other than God’s Law and being compelled to have any other domicile is a violation of his sincerely held religious views. See and rebut: <http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Domicile.pdf>
7. Counsel on either side do not receive any benefit derived from federal taxes in question and are not “taxpayers” as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14).
8. All parties who do not meet all of the above qualifications have recused themselves from participation in the proceeding.
9. All of the evidence submitted by the deponent so far in this proceeding is admitted into evidence and the court record is not sealed or otherwise censored in order to prevent the public from reading or learning all of the facts in dispute in this proceeding.

EXECUTED this 4th day of January, 2006.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

<<YOUR NAME>>

(Who is NOT “<<ALL CAPS NAME>>” or the “DEFENDANT” in this matter or the opposing party on the Complaint)