

explain and substantiate the manner in which the accusations are alleged to be wrongful, both with respect to the facts and the law, and whom is alleged to be damaged and how.

(2) The Judge is asked by the Plaintiff to instruct the jury that the Judge alone will control the evidence, without lawful authority, in violation of the Court's Rules of Evidence and the laws which support fair trials:

- (a) The Judge is to say he will control which exhibits will be accepted;
- (b) and the facts to which "all the lawyers have stipulated,"
- (c) in disregard of the Defendants' lack of lawyers.
- (d) The Judge is to forbid the Defendants to make any meaningful comparison between their instruments and those of the Federal Reserve;
- (e) and to forbid the Defendants to rebut the Plaintiffs point by point;
- (f) and to prevent the Defendants from revealing any conspiracy in which the Federal Reserve might be involved.
- (g) The Judge is to tell the jury "what is not evidence" in a manner that controls the mental impressions, i.e., prejudice, of the jurors.

Relief demanded: That the Judge shall be forbidden to exclude or in any other way to control any evidence offered to the Court, or to instruct the jury regarding how the jurors shall handle any evidence.

(3) The Judge is asked by the Plaintiff to instruct the jurors to do exactly as the Judge directs and not to think for themselves. They are only to rubber-stamp what he tells them. Examples:

- (a) The Judge is to tell the jury, "You must follow the law as I give it to you whether you agree with it or not ..." (Page 22); and
- (b) "You must follow all of my instructions." (page 22); and
- (c) "Do not do any research;" (page 16). and
- (d) "Testimony that has been excluded or stricken, or that you have been instructed to disregard, is not evidence and must not be considered." (page 28); and
- (e) It is important that you attempt to reach a unanimous verdict." (page 58).

Relief demanded: On grounds that such strict control defeats the purpose of a jury, the Judge should be enjoined from giving instructions that limit the use of the jurors' intelligence and conscience.

(4) On the other hand, the Plaintiff's Proposed Instructions asks that the jurors be required to do some thinking, such as:

- (a) They are to be allowed to think about "circumstantial and direct" evidence that is proved. (page 26) (This conflicts with the instructions listed above in Item (3).)
- (b) They are to be required to do "a careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence." (page 26) (This is impossible when the Judge withholds some of the evidence, as demanded by the Motion in Limine.)
- (c) They are to be instructed to decide how much weight to give each Defendant's statements. (page 36).

- (d) They are to give “opinion testimony” as much weight as they think “it deserves.” (page 37)
- (e) They are to give charts and summaries as much weight as they think the “underlying material” deserves. (page 38)
- (f) They are expected to discern whether a defendant “knowingly aided, counseled, commanded, induced or procured” a defendant to commit conspiracy or “unlawful manufacture of fictitious obligations.” (page 40)

However, the requested instructions do not disclose what school the jurors must attend to learn the “supporting material” or how many weeks of classes they will need to attend to acquire enough knowledge to competently judge such technical issues.

And remember: Knowledgeable prospective jurors are to be eliminated by the Voir Dire. **Relief demanded:** The Judge should be enjoined from including such ridiculously contradictory and impossibly technical requirements in the jury instructions.

CONCLUSION: The questions in the proposed Voir Dire, together with the requirements exemplified in Item (4) above, make it obvious that, if both are followed, it will be impossible to obtain a jury that is competent to judge the highly technical aspects of this Case without the jurors being educated by complete disclosure and explanation of all of the evidence, including theory, which supports the actions mentioned in the Indictment.

When these two items are taken together with the Motion in Limine, it is obvious that the Plaintiffs seek to corruptly use the judicial process for maintaining their own secret conspiracy and eliminating individuals who seek to reveal it. Such misuse of the Judiciary and the tax money which supports it, as well as concealment of public knowledge of matters which affect the economy and political well-being of this Nation, are unquestionably contrary to the Public Interest.

WHEREFORE, THE DEFENDANTS HEREBY MOVE THE COURT to **dismiss the entire Indictment** on grounds (1) that the Plaintiffs have failed to state a claim for which relief can be granted, and (2) that a fair trial is impossible.