Article 3,

Superior Common law Court of Record,

Montcalm County Venue

MRE Rule 202

Andrew Stuart Ouwenga, Sui Juris Case No. 17-S-22652-CK

Grievant,

Hon. \_\_Ronald J. Schafer\_ Judge/Magistrate

vs.

Reynolds Township Board Re: Tacit Agreement by ‘Default’.

Members, Sui Juris, et al. MCL 440.3601, NIHIL DICIT

Respondent(s).

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/

05/12/2017

**GRIEVANT’S RESPONDS TO REYNOLDS TOWNSHIP BOARD’S**

**REQUEST TO DISMISS ACTIONS IN THE**

**ABOVE CASE CAPTION MATTER / CASE NO. 17-S-226552-CK**

By Affidavit

COMES NOW, Andrew Stuart Ouwenga, one of the people, a natural man, Sui Juris in the above caption matter with the Grievant’s Responds To Reynolds Township Board’s Request To Dismiss Actions In The Above Case Caption Matter / Cause NO 17-S-22652-CK with the following.

The Grievant does not accept; does not CONSENT to SHEPHEN L. GRIMM, P.C. attempted conversion of Grievant’s Common Law Court of Record venue under Article 3 to that of the foreign Inferior CORPORATE Court of Equity under the ‘color of law’.

FACTS

1.] The NOTICE AND DEMAND TO REMOVE PRIVATE PROPERTY FROM PUBLIC TAX ROLL was filed in an “Article 3, Superior Common law Court of Record”, within the “Montcalm County Venue” where the status of all ‘Parties’ are Sui Juris, ‘Grievant’ and ‘Respondents’, and not a PLAINTIFF or DEFENDANT(S) within the inferior CORPORATE, ‘STATE OF MICHIGAN CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF MONTCALM; a Court of Equity.

2.] Andrew Stuart, Ouwenga is the Grievant, the CORPORATE, ANDREW STUART OUWENGA as the PLAINTIFF has no standing in the Article 3, Superior Common law Court of Record.

3.] The ‘CORPORATE’ REYNOLDS TOWNSHIP BOARD MEMBERS as Defendant(s) have no standing in the Article 3 Court. Only the Citizens, Sui Juris and States come within the venue of Article 3. There is no such thing as SUI JURIS; a legal entity as a DEFENDANT.

4.] Only the Hon. Ronald J. Schafer has standing in the Article 3, Superior Common law Court of Record, the ‘Corporate’ HON. RONALD J.SCHAFER P65466 has no Constitutional Authority to ‘Act Judicial’.

5.] An Article 3 Court only recognizes “Citizens” and “States” as ‘Parties’, a PROFESSIONAL CORORATION has no standing.

6.] MCL 450.681 states in pertinent part, “It shall be unlawful for any corporation or voluntary association to practice or appear as an attorney-at-law for any person other than itself in any court in this state or before any judicial body. . .”

This is also confirmed in MCR 6.003 DEFINITIONS, (1) “party includes the lawyer representing the party.” - As noted, it is a ‘Lawyer’ in law and not an ‘Attorney at Law’ who can represent a ‘party’ in court. Article 3 Sec. 2 confirms this relationship to “Law”, states in pertinent part, “The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, ‘in Law’ and Equity, arising under this Constitution. . .”

7.] STEPHEN L. GRIMM, P.C. request for dismissal of said claims and sanctions on behalf of Reynolds Township Board Members’, are absent of any ‘Contract’ or facts before the court to validate dismissal or sanctions. The ‘Attorney at law’, STEPHEN L. GRIMM, P.C. objections stand ‘mute’ and ‘void’ in this judicial tribunal ‘Court of Record’, under Article 3, Sec. 2 where the ‘judicial Power’ extends to all Cases “in Law”, not ‘at law’ by an Attorney.

8.] **MCL 750.218** **‘False pretenses** with intent to defraud’ states in pertinent part, (1) A person who, with the intent to defraud or cheat makes or uses a false pretense to do 1 or more of the following is guilty of a crime punishable as provided in this section: (a) Cause a person to grant, convey, assign, demise, lease, or mortgage land or an interest in land.

Parag. **(11)** As used in this section, **"false pretense"** includes, but is not limited to, a false or fraudulent representation, writing, communication, statement, or message, communicated by any means to another person, that the maker of the representation, writing, communication, statement, or message knows is false or fraudulent. The false pretense may be a representation regarding a past or existing fact or circumstance or a representation regarding the intention to perform a future event or to have a future event performed.

“I declare that the statements above are true to the best of my information, knowledge, and belief.”

By:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, Auth. Rep.

Andrew Stuart Ouwenga, Sui Juris, Affiant,

Secured Party Creditor, Attorney in fact,

Michigan National

Mailing Address:

c/o: 10213 Dagget Rd.

Howard City, Michigan [49329]

Cc: Reynolds Township Board Members, Sui juris.

c/o: 215 E. Edgerton St.

Howard City, Mich. [49329] Common Law Right Thumb Print Seal: -- >