

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF COLORADO

May 19, 2018
Hand Carried 2018 MAY 22 AM 8:15

JEFFREY B. COLWELL
CLERK

Laurence R. Goodman
P.O. Box 3792,
Boulder, Colorado 80307-3792

UNITED STATES COURT DISTRICT OF COLORADO,
Alfred A. Arrja Courthouse 901 19th Street, Denver Colorado 80294-3589.
Re: Case No. 1:17-cv-01680-RM-KLM. BY _____ DEP. CLK

STATE OF COLORADO)
) ss.
County of Boulder)

THIRD COMMERCIAL AFFIDAVIT - NOTICE OF INTEREST

For a three-week Jewish International Law,
(21 day) statutory Grace Period
18 USC 4 Issue: Demand for Removal based on the
natural unalienable right to self-defense by due process
of law and in opposition to "Motions in Limine"

I, Laurence R. Goodman, states and affirm as follows:

I received a transaction, entered on 12/28/2017 at 9:24 AM MST and filed on 12/28/2017 in Case Number: 1:17-cv-01680-RM-KLM

Case Name: Goodman v. Persons posing as Public Officers within Colorado State Government Agencies. However, on 10/19/2017 an AMENDED COMPLAINT was filed in this case entitled Laurence R. Goodman, et al., v. John W. Hickenlooper, et al., and Cynthia H. Coffman, et al.

Docket Text: The matter comes before the Court with the filing of pro se plaintiff Laurence R. Goodman, filed as a Commercial Instrument. A contract implies a commercial disclosure subject to the restrictions of: 18 U.S.C. § 4. The corrected status and standing is sui juris as a living man in private.

Denver District Court Judge in Case No. 17CR10088 Michael Spear and prosecuting attorney Robert Shapiro have contaminated the judicial process with deficiencies that render the process so unfair, as to result in a loss of rights, liberty, or property without due process of law, whether by suppression of evidence, suppression of law, or perjured testimony that would impeach it.

I allege and aver that the intent of the so-called grand jury indictment in its entirety is a fantasy created for the purpose of applying Motions in Limine. A Motion in Limine is not just an instrument or document. A Motion in Limine is a type of concept. Any process that is laid down to deny me of the natural unalienable right to self-defense is a Motion in Limine. It is actually a theoretical approach to destroy somebody. The thing that distinguishes man from the animals is that man has created guiding moral principles in which he has to be treated fairly. Meaning that man is not to be denied the natural unalienable right to self-defense. When that right is taken away it is a limiting factor. That is why it is called a Motion in Limine. It is better worded as a gag, an activity within a limitation. Limine is French for limit. By reason of the following facts in Case No. 17CR10088 I have been denied my natural unalienable right to a self-defense:

- a. A People's Motion in Limine, Addendum I, filed on 10/31/2017 in Case No. 17CR10088 eliminated my right of self-defense, amounting to a procedural Motion in Rape, like bending a woman over a barrel, in violation of United States Constitution Amendments I, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, and IX.
- b. Denver District Court Judge Michael Spear declared a suppression of evidence in fact and evidence in law, during a hearing on December 9, 2017, prohibiting me from speaking about purported activities relating to C.R.S. 24-22-101(1)(2017), in violation of the United States Constitution Amendments I, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, and IX.

Page 1 of 2
BOULDER COUNTY, State of Colorado
Certified to be a full, true and complete copy
as appears upon the records of my office.
HILLARY HALL, CLERK & RECORDER
By Richard Lacusky 5/21/18
Deputy Clerk Date
Richard Lacusky



- c. Prosecuting attorney Robert Shapiro admitted during a hearing on January 4, 2018, that there were 360 gig of discovery data in Case No. 17CR10088. However, the thumb drive he has provided is limited to 128 gigabytes of memory, thereby violating the 1963 Brady Material Law.
- d. Prosecutor, Robert Shapiro, has denied me the replicated/duplicate, effective and essential means of defense by refusing to return computers, private records, and books purloined from my home, thus shackling my unalienable right to self-defense in violation of the 1963 Brady Material Law, your very own corporate rule CRCP16, and U.S. Const. amend. V, which embraces the principles to wit:
 - “The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the person or things to be seized.”

By reason of the attached Notice of Default, from the un rebutted COMMERCIAL AFFIDAVIT – NOTICE OF INTEREST dated April 23, 2018 which resulted in a Judgment in Commerce, the warrant issued in Denver District Court Case No. 17CR10088 is defective.

- e. Denver District Court Judge Michael Spear denied me the right to the council of my choice and appointed a BAR Attorney on the case to block and oppress evidence in fact and evidence of law for defense.

Under a pretense that a judicial interest exists, privately held companies, the Office of the Governor, Office of the Attorney General, and the Judicial Court of Colorado are waging a ‘Mixed War’ on the People. See Blk’s Law Dict., 4th Ed., 1968, pg. 1754. Also see an 18 U.S.C. § 4 Mixed War Affidavit to JAG Officers COMMERCIAL AFFIDAVIT – NOTICE OF INTEREST and incorporated Addendum II. Also see 18 U.S.C. § 2331 “active war” resulting in injured and harmed daily by criminals in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1994, 42 U.S.C. § 12203, 18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242, 18 U.S.C. 1513, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1851 - 1589.

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 4 - Misprision of felony, UNITED STATES COURT DISTRICT OF COLORADO, you are required to acknowledge the authority of this code.

“Whoever, having knowledge of the actual commission of a felony cognizable by a court of the United States, conceals and does not as soon as possible make known the same to some judge or other person in civil or military authority under the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.”

Dun & Bradstreet numbers: State of Colorado – 815057126; Executive Office Of The State Of Colorado. A privately held company in Denver, CO., NAICS Code – 921110; COLORADO ATTORNEY GENERAL 802471543; ATTORNEY GENERAL, COLORADO - 802032104, 802031700, 802031714; the Judicial Court of Colorado – 802032104; Judiciary Courts of The State of Colorado - 361723943

See Boulder County Clerk and Recorder Public Records RF: 0351224, 03617756, 03617757, 03621011, 03622235, 03621011, 03623713, 03624329, 03627499*, 03651728, 03654046 and, 03654046.

The monetary clock is ticking. It is your choice. This mockery of law must be dismissed in the interest of justice.

I, Laurence R. Goodman, certify and swear on my own Commercial Liability, that I have read the foregoing instrument, titled THIRD COMMERCIAL AFFIDAVIT – NOTICE OF INTEREST, and know the content thereof, and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it is true, correct, complete, and not misleading, the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. I reserve the right and duty to update and correct this instrument as needed.

I, Laurence Rene’ Goodman autograph Laurence Rene’ Goodman make this claim.

Michael A. Gallucci
Witness

[Signature]
Witness

Michael A. Gallucci

[Signature]

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

Re: Case No. 1:17-cv-01680-RM-KLM.

I/we certify that true and correct copies of the THIRD COMMERCIAL AFFIDAVIT – NOTICE OF INTEREST (2 pages), Motion in Limine (5 pages), 18 U.S.C. § 4 Mixed War Affidavit to JAG Officers and incorporated Addendum II (7 pages), plus this certificate of mailing (15 pages total) were sent by first class mail, postage prepaid in a securely sealed envelope, on this the 21st day of May 2018, addressed to:

Alfred A. Arrja United States Courthouse
901 19th Street Rm A105
Denver, Colorado 80294-3589
Hand Carried

Office of the Attorney General
Washington, D.C. 20530
Certified Mail No. 7016 2710 0000 4448 5331

Matthew David Grove
Colorado Attorney General's Office
Ralph L. Carr Colorado Judicial Center
1300 Broadway
Denver, Colorado 80203
Certified Mail No. 7016 2710 0000 4448 5348

Office of the United States Attorney, District of Colorado
1225 17th Street, Suite 700
Denver, Colorado 80202
Certified Mail No. 7016 2710 0000 4448 5355

See Boulder County Clerk and Recorder Public Records RF: 03627499*:

Notice was not given to relevant Colorado State individuals pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b)(1), because the state court assumedly protected itself, signaling an intentional act to deny federal and state law. I was explicitly told in open court that I was not allowed to copy my pleadings to any relevant Colorado State individuals. Additionally, I was intimidated and threatened with a jail sentence by Judge Michael Spear in Denver District Court Case No. 17CR10088 and prosecuting attorney Robert Shapiro, in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1513, to prevent me from informing appropriate authorities of such activities.


Laurence R. Goodman

Addendum I

DISTRICT COURT, CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, COLORADO 520 W. Colfax Ave. Denver, Colorado 80204	DATE FILED: October 31, 2017 1:39 PM
PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO vs. LAURENCE GOODMAN, Defendant	COURT USE ONLY
BETH MCCANN, District Attorney Robert S. Shapiro, #26869 Special Deputy District Attorney 1300 Broadway, 9 th Floor Denver, CO 80203 720-508-6000 robert.shapiro@coag.gov	Case No: 17CR10088 Courtroom:
PEOPLE'S MOTION <i>IN LIMINE</i> AS A RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S NOTICE AND MEMORANDUM OF LAW RE: FIDUCIARY BOND OR RECOGNIZANCE	

Denver District Attorney, Beth McCann, by and through her Special Deputy District Attorney, Robert S. Shapiro, hereby files a Motion *in Limine* while also responding to the Defendant's Notice and Memorandum of Law Re: Fiduciary Bond or Recognizance ("Notice and Memorandum"). It is important to note in the Defendant's Notice that there is no obvious relief being requested by the Defendant, and as the title suggests, appears to only be notice of what the Defendant intends to argue during trial. As a result the People respectfully request of the Court that this response to the Defendant's Notice and Memorandum serve as a Motion *in Limine*, and the Court issue a pre-trial Order which would limit the presentation of evidence concerning the issues raise in the "Notice and Memorandum of Law Re: Fiduciary Bond and Recognizance" at the upcoming trial.

ARGUMENT

I. Bond Requirements for Officials

While the defendant does not expressly argue that the named victims are illegally serving in said position, he is presumably asserting that because bonds have not been posted, the witnesses do not have authority in their respective positions. Defendant attempts to do so by piecing together several different legal authorities, creating a block of non-controlling law. Defendant cites to the General Laws of the State of Colorado (1877), multiple volumes of Mill's Annotated Statutes of the State of Colorado (1883), and multiple codified versions of the Colorado Revised Statutes, ranging from 1953-2017. Defendant provides no context for the numerous citations, and instead lays out his incorrect theory of case law and ideology regarding bond requirements for certain officials in the State of Colorado. The majority of the law provided by the defendant has evolved over the last 100 plus years, which was not properly reflected in his Notice and Memorandum. As a result the Defendant has established

Addendum I

attempts to do this by stringing together legal authority, most of which is outdated. The defendant makes no attempt to follow the development of law through the 100 plus years of amendments, or possible repealing.

Pursuant to Art. 12, § 9 of the Colorado Constitution, “[o]fficers of the executive department and judges of the supreme and district courts, and district attorneys, shall file their oaths of office with the secretary of state; every other officer shall file his oath with county clerk of the county wherein he shall have been elected.”

The Colorado Court of Appeals has also addressed the defendant’s presumed argument, holding, even if a district attorney failed to file requisite paperwork [oath], no permanent vacancy in office was created. *People v. Scott*, 116 P.3d 1231 (Colo.App.2004). The defendant in *Scott* argued that the District Attorney was not authorized to prosecute the offenses because he failed to file his oath with the Secretary of State, and failed to pay the requisite bond. The court noted evidence of his oath and surety bond was sufficient. Additionally, the court explains that the District Attorney was acting as a “de facto” officer. The Court further discussed that in the case of an elected official if one receives a majority of the legal votes cast, is declared by the proper canvassing board to be duly elected, is inducted, and proceeds with the performance of the duties connected, he is a de facto officer. *Id.* at 1232.

In this case, all the named public servants were either duly elected, or appointed, with all of them having been inducted, followed by them performing the duties of their respective positions, and culminating with all of their oaths having been filed with an appropriate receiving office such as the Secretary of State or a County Clerk and Recorder. As a result there is no viable issue for the Court to resolve pertaining to the legitimacy of these public servants occupying their offices. Therefore, the Defendant’s Notice and Memorandum arguably appears to be a red herring with no applicable legal support to justify the proposition that the officials are occupying their offices illegally.

CONCLUSION

It is the People’s position that the Defendant’s Notice and Memorandum is simply a confusing and distracting filing with no discernable purpose in terms of addressing the relevant legal and factual issues in this pending case. It is important to note that the defendant (1) failed to request any cognizable relief; (2) failed to properly cite relevant or current legal authority, and (3) is trying to insert his skewed ideology into the case in an effort to create undue confusion for the jury. Assuming *arguendo* that the defendant’s argument is even accurate, let alone relevant, which it is not, such evidence would still be subject to an objection pursuant to Rule 403 of the Colorado Rules of Evidence. For these reasons, the People move this Court to also treat this response as a Motion *in Limine*, and issue a further Order precluding the defendant from presenting evidence concerning the topics raised in the “Notice and Memorandum of Law Re: Fiduciary Bond and Recognizance” at trial.

Addendum I

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the PEOPLE'S MOTION IN LIMINE AS A RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S NOTICE AND MEMORANDUM OF LAW RE: FIDUCIARY BOND OR RECOGNIZANCE was placed in the United States Mail, postage prepaid and correctly addressed, to the following Pro Se Defendant on this 31st day of October, 2017:

Laurence Goodman
PO Box 3792
Boulder, CO 80307

Addendum I

DISTRICT COURT, CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, COLORADO 520 W. Colfax Avenue Denver, CO 80204	
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO, v. Laurence Goodman, Defendant.	▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲
BETH MCCANN, District Attorney ROBERT S. SHAPIRO, Attorney Reg. # 26869 Special Deputy District Attorney 1300 Broadway, 9 th Floor Denver, CO 80203 (720) 508-6000 robert.shapiro@coag.gov	Case No.: 17CR10088 Courtroom: 5D Assigned to Judge Michael Spear of the 18 th JD
PEOPLE'S NOTICE TO DEFENDANT OF THE PROSECUTION'S INTENT TO OFFER CERTIFIED DOMESTIC RECORDS OF REGULARLY CONDUCTED ACTIVITY PURSUANT TO CRE 902(11) DURING THE UPCOMING JURY TRIAL	

The People of the State of Colorado by and through the undersigned Special Deputy District Attorney, hereby are providing the Defendant with the required written notice of the prosecution's intention to offer certified domestic records of regularly conducted activity pursuant to CRE 902(11) and rely on the following:

1. The Defendant is currently set for two-week Jury Trial beginning on January 8, 2018. It is the People's stated intention to offer a set of certified domestic records that were provided by Fidelity Capital Holdings, Inc. d/b/a Fidelity Creditor Service. These records have been certified by a records custodian from that business entity as being documents that are the result of regularly conducted activities by the business entity. Specifically the records custodian from the business entity have certified that the records at issue were:

- a. made at or near the time of the occurrence of the matters set forth by, or from information transmitted by, a person with knowledge of those matters;
- b. kept in the course of the regularly conducted activity; and
- c. made by the regularly conducted activity as a regular practice.

2. The records at issue have been made available to the Defendant with the original affidavits/declarations from each custodian currently accessible for inspection by the Defendant. Providing the defendant the opportunity in advance to inspect both the affidavits and the actual records is a requirement before the People can offer these records. CRE 902(11). The defendant simply needs to contact the Attorney General's office to arrange for a mutually agreeable date, time and location for the defendant to review the records that are at issue.

Addendum I

Beth McCann
District Attorney

/s/ Robert S. Shapiro
Robert S. Shapiro, 26869
Special Deputy District Attorney

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the _____ day of October 2017, a true and correct copy of this pleading was served upon the Pro Se Defendant, by mailing them a copy of the above entitled pleading via the United States Postal Service, postage prepaid and addressed as follows:

Laurence R. Goodman
P.O. Box 3792
Boulder, CO 80307-3792

Signature

LINDSEY-FLANIGAN COURTHOUSE, 520 West Colfax Avenue, Denver, Colorado 80204

An 18 U.S.C. § 4 Mixed War Affidavit to JAG Officers: [COMMERCIAL AFFIDAVIT – NOTICE OF INTEREST]

The issue of this Notice: Criminal oligarchy acting in treason to the U.S. Military Selective Service oath.

Donald Trump, U.S. President, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., Washington, DC 20500

Secretary of Defense, 1000 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301-1000

U.S. Navy, OJAG, 1322 Patterson Ave., Suite 3000 Washington Navy Yard, DC 20374 - 5066

U.S. Navy, Staff Judge Advocate's Office, Larson Hall Annapolis, MD 21402 – 0000

U.S. Army, OSJA – Criminal Law, 9990 Belvoir Drive, Building 257, Fort Belvoir, VA 22060

U.S. Army, JAG, Building 6222, 1633 Mekong St., Fort Carson, CO 80913

U.S. Air Force, Buckley AFB, 460 SW/JA, 510 S. Aspen Street, Suite 230, Buckley, AFB, CO 80011

U.S. Marine Corps Forces Reserve, Augment, Reinforce, Support, 2000 Opelousas Ave., New Orleans, LA 70114

THE PEOPLE [THE OFFICIALS]
OF THE STATE OF COLORADO
Plaintiff, [18 U.S.C. § 1621]

Case No. 17CR10088, [17CR10087] (GJ case No.: 16CR001)

COMMERCIAL AFFIDAVIT – NOTICE OF INTEREST

For a three week (21 day) statutory grace period
for exhausting any commercial remedies.

v.

Laurence R. Goodman, P.O. Box 3792, Boulder, Colorado 80307

and [Steve Byfield, U.S. Navy, honorably discharged in 1980, domestically still active.]

Defendant.

[OFFICIAL] PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

The Mixed War belligerents (combatants),

The Mixed War Offensive Declarant Parties

Robert S. Shapiro, et al.,

Michael Spear, et al.

v.

Laurence R. Goodman,

and [Steve Byfield, U.S. Navy, honorably discharged in 1980, domestically still active.]

The Mixed War belligerents (combatants) common citizens

Mixed War Defensive Party

Defending the Constitution for the United States of America against all enemies foreign and domestic

This is not in a court jurisdiction; it is currently a Military Imperative!

Laurence R. Goodman,

and [Steve Byfield, U.S. Navy, honorably discharged in 1980, domestically still active.]

The Mixed War belligerents (combatants) common citizens

Third party counter plaintiffs

Defending the Constitution for the United States of America

against all enemies foreign and domestic.

v.

[OFFICIAL] PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Mixed War belligerents

Mixed War declarant third parties including Deputy Attorney General, Robert Shapiro, "Esq. nobility class", U.S. Army

Intelligence, who by declaring himself to be a member of the nobility class BAR Registration No. 26869, is deliberately

violating the Constitution for the United States of America and military Selective Service oath by failing to defend the

Constitution for the United States of America against all enemies foreign and domestic.

State of Colorado)

County of Denver) ss.

I, Laurence R. Goodman, one of the common People of Colorado, a defendant, and a third party counter plaintiff,
and on the other side the commercial Enterprise known as [OFFICIAL] PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO, cannot

proceed any further with Case No.17CR10088, [et. Al.], without a response to the following COMMERCIAL AFFIDAVIT – NOTICE OF INTEREST and counter claims:

Goodman and all the common People of Colorado have been denied a republican due process form of law, government resulting in a loss of constitutionally protected rights, liberty, and property to a criminal oligarchy [the BAR Association nobility], which has infiltrated all branches of the enterprise known as the Colorado State Government. It is the duty of the common People of Colorado under 18 U.S.C. § 4 (misprision of felony) to report all crimes cognizable under the laws of the United States of America.

Mr. Robert Shapiro “Esq. nobility class”, BAR Registration No. 26869, who was a U.S. Army Intelligence Officer, has presumably taken the Selective Service oath to defend the Constitution for the United States of America against all enemies foreign and domestic under 5 U.S.C. § 3331, an oath to serve the public, by public loyalty, and bonded by his life, an oath which never expires until the end of one’s life or the complete healing of his battle injuries. By virtue of the nobility clauses: Article I, Sec. 9, Cl. 8, Article I Sec. 10, Cl. 1, and the original Amendment XIII Constitution for the United States of America (1819), Assistant Attorney General for Colorado, Shapiro has betrayed and is acting in treason against the Constitution by not honoring his said Selective Service oath, and working for a state government not loyal to the Constitution for the United States of America. See (Addendum I), two pages*.

Shapiro has violated his covenant oath with the Selective Service pursuant to the Uniform Code of Military Justice found at 10 U.S.C. § 899 and is using military skills against the common People of Colorado. Shapiro has combined with others to subject the common People of Colorado to a jurisdiction foreign to the Constitution and unacknowledged by their laws; giving his consent to other acts of pretended law. (See Addendum II), two pages*. Additionally, Shapiro has utilized FBI agents, other military personal who violated their covenant Selective Service oath, and to act in collusion with him to incite insurrection and to spy on the common People of Colorado. This included but was not limited to a Marshal Springer former Lance Corporal, USMC and Keith Heavilin, also a former U.S. Army Intelligence Officer.

Shapiro is attacking the common People of Colorado who are trying to correct the official criminal activity in Colorado. Shapiro is treating the common People of Colorado as criminals, which is disgusting and dishonorable, by putting them into jail for doing their civilian duty under title 18 U.S.C. § 4 (misprision of felony). Those common People of Colorado have not received one dime of pay and have spent much of their own savings fighting this Mixed War. One of the common People of Colorado indicted for doing his duty under 18 U.S.C. § 4, defending the Constitution pursuant to his Selective Service Oath is Steve Byfield. He was on active duty in the U.S. Navy 1974-1980 serving aboard a guided missile cruiser as a third class petty officer electrician’s mate in addition to serving on shore patrol when he was overseas. Steve Byfield was sentence to 30 years in Fremont Correctional Facility in Colorado as a political prisoner under the guise of the frivolous paperwork to prevent him from exposing the truth about the aforesaid criminal activity.

The Indictment against nine of the common People of Colorado was frivolous because it violates the truth. See (Addendum II), two pages*.

CERTIFICATION

I, Laurence R. Goodman, certify and swear on my own Commercial Liability, that I have read the foregoing instrument, titled COMMERCIAL AFFIDAVIT – NOTICE OF INTEREST, and know the content thereof, and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it is true, correct, complete, and not misleading, the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. I reserve the right and duty to update and correct this instrument as needed.

Laurence R. Goodman...make this claim.

Tom Connell
Witness 3-16-2018

Maxwell Powers
Witness 03-16-2018

Addendum I *-- Memorandum of Law

The Colorado State Racketing Enterprise

The History of the Colorado Enterprise

The origin of the Colorado Attorney System

The common People/publics' legal documentary creations must be construed liberally because the common people are accustomed to using ordinary words from ordinary dictionaries. The common People/public are not given a formal education in the government's own self-created language and self-serving fantasies, fictions, and machinations, applied by the nobility class operating the judicial system.

To put it simply, the English attorney system is the foundation of the BAR association. [British Accreditation Registry]. The BAR Association is the British Labor Union of Law. It is Great Britain's method of controlling America from England. The Judges of the American courts are the labor union bosses of the closed union shops (courts) of the American branch of the English BAR association, and the American attorneys are the inferior judicial officers of the labor union shop (courts) of the American based English BAR association. Attorneys that operate as public defenders are licensed operators in the closed union shops, (courts). The legal system of the American BAR association is under absolute control of the judges. If an attorney does not absolutely obey the orders of the judge, the judge can exercise his power to take away his bar card. Simply put, if the common person on the street does not pay off to the BAR Association then that common citizen will be deprived of his due process of law. That condition is a form of racketeering. Therefore, the primary commercial racketeering Enterprise of the State of Colorado is a BAR Association protection insurance racket Enterprise.

The origin attorney system

The so called "Colorado Nine" have been accused of exercising or committing a racketeering enterprise. The state of Colorado is engaged in a racketeering enterprise. The Colorado State enterprise will now be described. Hereinafter, the Colorado State Enterprise will be referred to as "THE ENTERPRISE". The foundation of THE ENTERPRISE was established in approximately 1190 AD. Of course the State of Colorado was not in existence yet. To fully understand the foundation of THE ENTERPRISE, it is necessary to reach back a bit further in time. Like all other enterprises, its purpose was to provide money. This historical account will begin in old England. The Kings of England fought battles. Their military were called knights. The care takers and shield bearers of the Knights were called Esquires. A Knights' allegiance to the King was rewarded in landed property, what is now called "real estate". These Knights were called land-lords. Serfs tilled the land and the Knights profited from their labor. This was called the feudal system of England.

The Kings' necessity.

“Necessity is the mother of invention.” (Plato) The Kings needed to raise money for their armies and their wars. The Jews of the time were a nomadic people. The Jews had been barred from owning real property and barred from joining trade guilds. So to speak, the Jews carried their property on their back and the tools of their trade in their brains. They became very clever with numbers, mathematics, and the sciences. The Jews had remarkable street savvy and success in the subject of handling money as bankers. The Jews had money to offer upon which they charged and gained interest. In order for the King to borrow the Jew' money, the King, had to come up with collateral, and that collateral consisted of real property, land. In order to get money from these bankers the King had to take back property from the Knights. This threatened to cause an upset in the social class structure of England. When property was transferred or attorned from Knight to Knight, the class structure had to be protected by a ceremony. The property was being turned over attorned. The ceremony was called attornment. The ceremony was conducted by an Esquire also known as an attorney. The purpose of the attorney was to guarantee the class structure of England, to keep the rich rich and make the poor poor.

The process of using real property, land, as collateral to guarantee the loaning of money, brought the English feudal system to an end. In 1215 AD the Magna Carta was established. Even more important, all of these events served to weld together, into one system of law, the common law of England and the commercial law of the Jews. By 1300 AD the kings thought they could do without the help of the Jews. For a detailed history of this period from 1190 AD to 1300 AD refer to the Georgetown Law Journal at vol. 71, pgs. 1179 to 1200, to an article titled “The Shetar's Effect on English Law -- A Law of the Jews Becomes the Law of the Land”, authored by Judith A. Shapiro, a member of a famous family of attorneys. The figurehead that brought the Jews back into Europe was Mayer Amschel Rotchschild, who's famous quote was, “Give me control of a nation's money and I care not who makes its laws.”.

Addendum II*

The Indictment against nine of the common People of Colorado violates the truth.

Due Process: "No State shall pass any law impairing the Obligation of Contracts" Article 1, Section 10, Clause 1, of the Constitution for the United States of America.

A form of Obligation of Contract for the collection of a debt stated on paper, is an Affidavit Invoice called a Lien. Such a Lien, under the conditions of Mixed War, or the deliberate intent to avoid the payment of a debt, has the power of a Letter of Marque and Reprisal, legally defined as a letter to march or cross boundaries and to seize property (take and return). Therefore, "No State shall pass any Law impairing a Lien."

Without Commercial Affidavit Invoices/Liens, nations could not collect debts from each other without war. Therefore, International Commercial Treaty Law mandates the continuity of the commercial collection process, which has, at its very foundation, the Commercial Lien.

Commercial Liens and Commercial Distresses are writings used to establish a citizen's reasonable right to act with Legal Force, and to seize property, to satisfy commercial obligations. Commercial Liens and Commercial Distresses can [pursuant to: 18 U.S.C. § 4 MANDATORY COMPLAINT and 42 U.S.C. § 1986 REASONABLE DILIGENCE] be lawfully used by a private citizen, or by a Public Minister, or by a Public Proxy, as weapons of self-defense and as weapons of Mixed War against corrupt officers of the government. Therefore, Commercial Liens and Commercial Distresses are akin to firearms, and are guaranteed to the citizen as lawful remedies under Amendment II of the Constitution for the United States of America, Right to keep and bear Arms.

Robert Shapiro, posing as a state officer, and the Denver District Court, have no commercial jurisdiction over Commercial Affidavit Liens, which are filed pursuant to the 18 U.S.C. § 4 mandate to report violations of the Constitution for the United States of America committed by persons unlawfully posing as real public officials. Therefore, the issues relating to the said Commercial Liens, as filed in state courts are erroneous and fraudulent, and must be dealt within a commercial court which is functionally legitimately and harmonious with the Constitution for the United States of America and the United States Selective Service Oath to defend that constitution.

The common People of Colorado are laying claim to the evidence of Shapiro's foregoing said error of due process. The indictment is constructed in a manner which is violation of the correct method of presenting the Nature and Cause of the Accusations which is guaranteed under the Amendment VI, Constitution for the United States of America. Shapiro's signature is illegible, the signature of a person who is arrogant and or does not want to accept responsibility for his action. When there is only one signature on a brief without any other witnesses, and that one signature is illegible, then the person who signed it, and is commercially responsible for it cannot be identified with any certainty. It has no commercial reality.

Additionally, the Indictment fails to tell the truth that the persons who are posing as public officials, who are required to know the law, who were notified that they are not doing their jobs, and who are receiving payment for services not rendered, are committing embezzlement, fraud, and theft. See reference to federal Case No. 1:17-cv-02151 below.

Shapiro cannot be trusted because he is acting in treason against his Selective Service Oath. No one has sworn to the truth of the Indictment. Therefore, the entire Indictment is hearsay F.R.E. 801.

Shapiro signed the Indictment for ulterior reasons: to make money; to satisfy the officials Shapiro worked with rather than to fulfill his obligation to this nation's Constitution and the nations Selective Service Oath; to conceal the crimes of other Colorado Officials; and Shapiro's retaliation for exposing those crimes 18 U.S.C. § 1513: and Shapiro is engaging in human trafficking of the common People of Colorado in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1994, 18 U.S.C. § 1581, 18 U.S.C. § 1589, 18 U.S.C. § 241, 18 U.S.C. § 242, 18 U.S.C. § 4, 18 U.S.C. § 3, 18 U.S.C. § 1622, and 18 U.S.C. § 1621.

By virtue of the following, Shapiro has no legitimate authority to issue an Indictment against any of the common People of Colorado: A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS, WINFRED P. ADAMS, Major, USAF, Retired v. GOVERNMENT OF THE STATE OF COLORADO, Case No. 1:17-cv-02151, filed in United States District Court in and for the District of Colorado, on September 5, 2017. As a result, the GOVERNMENT OF THE STATE OF COLORADO has acquiesced to the fact that there are no public officials lawfully holding public office in the State of Colorado.

Shapiro and the court have prevented me (Laurence R. Goodman Affiant) from presenting information, arguments, and filings in my own defense without the consent of my attorney. Shapiro and the person posing as a judge, Michael Spear, in Denver District Court Case No. 17CR10088 blocked all of my defense by imposing a motion in limine on me. That motion in limine was used by Shapiro and Spear as a weapon against me and my first amendment guarantees, which makes it practically impossible for me to obtain a fair trial. I have been prevented from filing any affidavits on my own behalf, that is a fine example of duress of threat, and denied the means to inspect discovery as a result the theft of private property.

“The prosecutor’s recent expanded use of the motion in limine to exclude an entire defense threatens traditional concepts of criminal trial practice. When the courts requires the defense to respond to the government’s filing of such a motion, it has already skewed the scales of justice by providing the prosecution with information on the defendant’s case in advance of trial and consequently lightening the prosecutions burden of proof at trial. At the same time, the requirement of answering to this motion subverts three crucial rights of criminal defendants: the right against self-incrimination, the right to remain silent, and the right to be presumed innocent. When such motions are granted, a defendant’s right to present a full defense becomes severely compromised. And in the context of trial by jury, the effect of granting such a motion may be to remove the determination of guilt or innocence from the jury’s hands.” ... “but also because it suppresses evidence concerning government policy that is essential to he cultivation of an informed citizenry.” See Stanford Law Review, July 1987 vol. 39 pg. 1271 an article titled THE MOTION IN LIMINE IN POLITICALLY SENSITIVE CASES: SILENCING THE DEFENDANT AT TRIAL authored by Douglas L. Colbert.

A witness at a related trial, March 2018, Denver District Court, reported that one of Shapiro’s victims, an American man named Bruce Doucette asked pointed questions and hypotheticals about the Seventh Amendment (the right to trial by jury). “Does it not say that common law applies?” Doucette asked the [FBI] agent. “No, that’s a misinterpretation.” FBI English replied on the stand. “Oh,” Doucette answered meekly, then stalled for more than a minute... “So if somebody believes they have a constitutional right to do something, do you believe that they are committing a crime if they believe they are following the constitution?” “There...could still be [criminal] intent there,” [FBI Agent], English replied after thinking a moment. FBI Agent English, exposed the paramount conversion of law in one rather unintelligible word: whereby the supreme law of the land is now a formulated jurisdictional nature process of 'Substantive rights/duties' and its handmaiden of 'Procedures'. An absolute defiance to the rules of the common law is a criminal, contemptible, insanity of evil perversion, to a quasi 1% house rule game of chance.

Conclusion

The Constitution for the United States of America, was established as a commercial contract with the world at large, known as a Commercial Treaty. It told, all the world, that the people of the United States of America would operate as a viable nation with full commercial respect for all of the other nations, in the conduct of international business, and pay its international trade debts to the other nations of the world. But a nation of people who violate the Constitution, and allow their leaders to violate the Constitution, will lose the economic benefits that the Constitution was designed to provide and protect, and that nation will lose the respect of the world, and be overrun by the other nations.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I/we certify that true and correct copies of An 18 U.S.C. § 4 Mixed War Affidavit to JAG Officers: [COMMERCIAL AFFIDAVIT – NOTICE OF INTEREST] The issue of this Notice: Criminal oligarchy acting in treason to the U.S. Military Selective Service Oath plus Addendum I, two pages* and Addendum II, two pages* were sent by first class mail, postage prepaid in a securely sealed envelope, on this the 16TH day of March, 2018, addressed to:

Donald Trump, U.S. President, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., Washington, DC 20500

Secretary of Defense, 1000 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301-1000
Certified Mail No. 7016 2710 0000 4448 5201

U.S. Navy, OJAG, 1322 Patterson Ave., Suite 3000 Washington Navy Yard, DC 20374 – 5066
Certified Mail No. 7016 2710 0000 4448 5218

U.S. Navy, Staff Judge Advocate's Office, Larson Hall Annapolis, MD 21402 – 0000
Certified Mail No. 7016 2710 0000 4448 5225

U.S. Army, OSJA – Criminal Law, 9990 Belvoir Drive, Building 257, Fort Belvoir, VA 22060
Certified Mail No. 7016 2710 0000 4448 5232

U.S. Army, JAG, Building 6222, 1633 Mekong St., Fort Carson, CO 80913
Certified Mail No. 7016 2710 0000 4448 5249

U.S. Air Force, Buckley AFB, 460 SW/JA, 510 S. Aspen Street, Suite 230, Buckley, AFB, CO 80011
Certified Mail No. 7016 2710 0000 4448 5256

U.S. Marine Corps Forces Reserve, Augment, Reinforce, Support, 2000 Opelousas Ave., New Orleans, LA 70114
Certified Mail No. 7016 2710 0000 4448 5263

Office of the United States Attorney, 1225 17th Street, Suite 700, Denver, Colorado 80202
Certified Mail No. 7016 2710 0000 4448 5287

Office of the Attorney General, Washington, D.C. 20530
Certified Mail No. 7016 2710 0000 4448 5294

Judicial Watch, 425 Third Street SW, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20024

LINDSEY-FLANIGAN COURTHOUSE, 520 West Colfax Avenue, Denver, Colorado 80204

This court and its officers are implicitly threatening my hired attorney with a loss of her bar license if she does not prevent me from personally filing my paperwork to the court. I have been sworn to tell in front of the court room and then denied the opportunity to present the truth.

Colorado Office of the Attorney General, Business and Licensing, 1300 Broadway, 8th Floor, Denver, CO 80203
The court and its officers are implicitly threatening me to prevent the serving of paperwork on the parties. I have been sworn to tell the truth in front of the court room and then denied the opportunity to present the truth.

Lawrence R. Goodman