




Ensminger was trying to establish that he had the highest title and the court knew that it did not have jurisdiction on the title issue as it refused to convene as a court "in" law.


2. The order, on the second page, contains the phrase "... the facts of the courts original jurisdiction, exclusive to the people, did speak, and was placed into evidence." By quoting this statement from the decision of the COMMON LAW COURT, the court of the people, the Tenth Circuit court recognized the decision, venue and jurisdiction of the COMMON LAW COURT! 

3. Most important is to follow the asterisk behind the ORDER AND JUDGMENT\* to the bottom of the first page to read the statement to which it refers. It says "This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel." (Emphasis added) This means that it is binding precedent for res judicata which means that it has already been decided by a court of competent jurisdiction and collateral estoppel which means the opponent cannot bring it up again. 

What court of competent jurisdiction made a decision? The only court involved in this case that made any kind of decision was the Common Law Court. The District court dismissed for lack of jurisdiction and the Tenth Circuit affirmed. Therefore, the doctrine of res judicata in this case could only apply to the Common Law Court. 

Since the Common Law Court cannot be reviewed, the Tenth Circuit could not state that they affirmed that decision. All they could do was to affirm the District court's dismissal for lack of jurisdiction. But, by quoting from the Common Law Court's decision and establishing that res judicata exists, the Tenth Circuit has agreed with the Common Law Court. The People Have Spoken! The implications of this are truly astounding!

Mr. Ensminger is now in the process of going back to the state court with the Common Law Court decision to remove the case from them and render their judgment null and void.

To add to the validity of this understanding of the Tenth Circuit decision it is important to note that there have been other successes incorporating this decision into a judicial notice to the other courts, and removing these cases to the venue of the Common Law Court. In one such case, James A. Elliott & United States Bankruptcy Court for the Western District of Oklahoma, the bankruptcy court agreed with the Common Law Court's decision and ordered that Mr. Elliott receive all of his property back even though it had been sold and taken from his possession. 

It is clear that, as more people become involved with the Common Law Court and more cases are heard, we will see more and more success in being able to remove ourselves from the oppression and tyranny of the de facto U.S. "system" and more firmly establish the authority of the people through the Common Law.