

**Transcribed Notes, of: the Trial of Laurence Goodman; in the
Colorado State District Court, District of Denver; Case #: 17CR10088.
31 Pages of Notes, hand-written, by Charles Stewart;
& completed on the last day of trial: 2019-January-18, Friday;
& “Transcribed” to text here-in: 2019-January, 20 - 26.**

~~~~~  
<Page-1>: 2019-January-7, Monday. First day of trial.

“Laurence Goodman”, aka Larry, opened by declaring his “Special Appearance”.

Larry also demanded to proceed at Common-Law.

Presiding Judge Spear here categorically “Denied” Mr Goodman’s above described Demand to “Proceed at Common-Law”.

<break for Jurors preliminary selection, half hour or more.>

Municipal/Provisional Denver Deputy Prosecutor “Robert Shapiro” declared he was here to prosecute. FBI Agent “Ryan English” assisted Shapiro.

Deputy Sheriff “Chris Burn” was also assisting Shapiro.

(Shapiro opened private discussion with me. He asked if I was staying with Larry. I evaded answering.)

Larry objected to the Jurors being “U.S. Citizens”.

Presiding provisional municipal “Judge Michael Spear” effectively Overruled Goodman’s objection.

<http://www.coloradojudicialperformance.gov/retention.cfm?ret=1577>

[https://www.courts.state.co.us/Bio.cfm?Employee\\_ID=419](https://www.courts.state.co.us/Bio.cfm?Employee_ID=419) / Phone: 720-437-6292

Larry gave a verbal “Second Notice” of his basic objections.

Presiding Judge Spear clearly and repeatedly told the Jurors to Not be concerned about “Law”, because he would tell the Jurors what “Law” is.

Judge Spear continued on to affirm that the basis for “Reasonable Doubt”, was “Reason and Common Sense”, and that Jurors had a Duty there-under to be “Fair and impartial”.

When Judge Spear gave the Jurors their Oath, each Juror there-under affirmed that they would render a “Just Verdict”.

Judge Spear briefly asked each Juror to affirm that they were “U.S. Citizens”.

This point was rushed through quickly by Judge Spear; and Larry raised his hand to object about that issue; but Judge Spear ignored him.

Judge Spear repeatedly referred to his personal comments as “Comments of the Court”.

Spear stated that he expected the trial to last through 2019-January-18.

~~~~~  
<Page 2: 2019-January-8, Tuesday. Second day of trial.>

Presiding Judge Spear opened by affirming a “Presumption of Innocence” for Larry.

Deputy Prosecutor “Stockley” opened by quoting that Larry had said “Go and Grab Her”, with reference to Judge Carolyn Moore; & all of which Stockley said was the equivalent of advocating the “Kidnapping” of Judge Moore.

Stockley went on to declare that Judge Moore and the other Public-Servants involved in this case had “No Duty to Respond” to the multitude of “Notice of Fraud” and related documents that Larry Goodman and the other members of the group had sent to them.

First Witness: Ryan English:

Ryan English is a Local Denver-area FBI-Agent, who claims expertise in “Sovereign Citizen Ideology”. He has been a “Bar Member Attorney” in the State of Connecticut, he has a Bachelor's Degree in History; & he is a member of a local “Joint Terrorism Task Force”.

English voiced concerns about lawless “Vigilantes”, & he cited “Sheriff Mack” as a good example of how modern activists should more lawfully pursue their grievances against holders of Public-Offices. He said his concerns were so serious that he felt compelled to recruit an Infiltrator, named “Marshal Spring”, to infiltrate the group Larry had been associated with, and to report back to him and his associates about the group’s activities

Larry asked English about the word “Bar”, as related to his membership in the Connecticut “Bar Association”; and English replied that this word only refers to the “Bar of the Court”, that divides the audience from the parties and Court Officers in the larger Court-Room; and English confidently affirmed that word has absolutely nothing to do with the common patriot argument that it is an acronym for “British Accredited Registry”.

FBI Agent English went on to declare that the “Von Schlisen” investigation and arrest was what started the entire ideological conflict. The discussion affirmed that Goodman and associates were arguing that “Judge Moore” does Not have a proper “Oath of Office” to sentence and hold Ms Von Schlisen in jail.

Mr English went on to declare how wording in the documents sent to suspected corrupted Public Servants, wording was used indicating that if said Public Servants did not comply with the accountability demands there-by placed on them, that an ambiguous “Or Else” phraseology which was contained in many of those documents, was construed by Mr English and his ideological group members to be some sort of a “Threat” against those “Public Servants”.

Second Witness: Nathan Gerard:

Nathan Gerard is a Colorado State Police Officer; he is a member of the Denver area “Fusion Center”, and of the FBI’s “Domestic Terrorism Task Force”. Mr Gerard has college degrees in “Justice Administration” and “Psychology”.

<Page 3>:

Nathan Gerard continued his testimony by declaring that he is expert in “Sovereign Citizen Ideology”. Larry cross-examined Gerard, by asking Gerard: “What is Your Ideology?”.

Larry was not able to get a straight-answer from Gerard on that question.

Gerard’s email-address is: <nathan.garard@state.co.us>

Third Witness: Kristin Varel:

Ms Varel is an FBI Agent in the Denver area; she is a member of a group calling them-selves the “Public Corruption Squad”; and she only testified briefly in support of the Prosecutors, .

Fourth Witness: Scott Schons:

Mr Schons is an FBI Agent in the Denver area; he is a Leader of the “Cyber Squad” and the “Evidence Response Team”. He is a “Certified Public Accountant”, and he has a “Masters Degree” in something from some college somewhere.

Mr Schons received the "Search Warrant" upon which Larry's apartment was searched. Besides Schons, five other officers were involved in that raid/search. Schons further testified that the search lasted 5-hours, and that many items were seized.

Larry cross-examined Schons by focusing on a document which Larry inferred caused a "Breach of the County Charter", and all of which Larry further inferred amounted to "Criminal" actions by these people claiming to be "Public Servants".

Fifth Witness: Kimberly Milka:

Kimberly Milka is an FBI Agent in the Denver Field Office, and she has completed college-level studies in "Criminal Justice". The brief notes here indicate she may have supervisory authority over Ryan English and Chris Byrne.

Sixth Witness: Chris Byrne:

Chris Byrne is a Jefferson County Sheriff's Deputy; and he has obtained certified credentials from college institutions indicating his competence in both "Psychology" and "Psychiatry". Deputy Byrne has been assigned "Federal Law-Enforcement Authority", including membership in an "FBI Task Force". <https://coloradosheriffs.org/job-board/>

<Page 4>:

Chris Byrne assisted in the execution of the Search Warrant which was issued for the search of Larry's home. Mr Byrne affirmed that Chief Denver District Court Judge Martinez had proven to Byrne that the Requirements for "Probable Cause" were Lawfully Complied With in the issuance of that Search Warrant, and there-under that his execution of the Search Warrant was also entirely "Lawful".

Mr Byrne testified, that, after he and others had Arrested Larry and confined him in a small police department room for an interview; that Larry complained to him that, when Holders of "Public Offices" had not properly executed and filed their "Oath of Office", that this amounts to "Treason".

A video was then played for everyone in the court, and there-in Larry was shown providing fuller context, where-in Larry had clearly stated that this "Treason" was a reasonable deduction from the massive evidence that multitudes of municipal public servants were routinely making "Arrests With-Out Warrants", and that effectively amounts to "War" against the People of Colorado & the USA, aka: "Treason".

Chris Byrne went on to declare that the groups "Continental Marshals" had "No Lawful Authority" to act as the Executive Officers which they claimed to be.

Chris Byrne further affirmed that the "County Courts got Absorbed by the State Court System", at some time in the history of Colorado,

~~~~~  
<2019-January-9, Wednesday. Third day of trial.>

Chris Byrne was cross-examined by Larry.

Judge Spear clearly referenced "Jury Control Mechanisms".

During a court break; Prosecutor Shapiro and this author got in an argument about the Constitutional Right to "Assistance of Counsel", with Mr Shapiro claiming that Constitutional provision only allowed for "Bar Member Attorneys". I responded by accusing Mr Shapiro of "Twisting the Original Constitutional Intent".

Mr Shapiro responded by saying: "I am Not going to Argue with you, Mr Stewart"; & he indicated his desire to end the conversation, with which I said "Right", and complied.

Seventh Witness: Robin Lee Copeland:

Ms Copeland is a Librarian in a Law Library, I believe in the city of Boulder. Ms Copeland said that “Mr Goodman was determined to find library resources which supported his cause”; and that “Mr Goodman was frequently frustrated and angry”. Ms Copeland accused Larry of discussing “Storming the County Jail”, in efforts to free Charlene from her un-lawful imprisonment there-in.

<Page 5>:

Robin Copeland continued by informing the court of how an Oregon activist who was known as “Judge Darby” had directed Robin on how to up-load documents to the web-page entitled as “International Commercial Recording Office, Public Access”, or “ICROPA”.

Robin testified that the large dollar value in the commercial liens and fines were alarming to her; as was the references by group members to “Storming the Jail”, in protest. Robin seemed to infer a Non-Violent form of “Storming the Jail”.

Larry had been patronizing the law library where Robin worked, for about ten years.

Ryan English again took the witness stand; but it was a brief testimony, with no other notes entered.

Eighth Witness: Marshall Spring: Marshal Marshall:

Mr Spring is from Oregon, he is an ex Marine, who participated in the Iraq war, and who is skilled with handling explosives. He also is an ex Police Officer, he graduated from hi-school in 2001, and he was married until his wife committed suicide.

Mr Spring was recruited by officers in the FBI, to infiltrate and subvert the activities of the of the group of Colorado Constitutionals with whom Larry Goodman had been associated. Mr Spring there-in used the FBI Code-Name “Erp”. Mr Spring first contacted Steven Nulty; and Nulty and the other leaders were stupid enough to appoint this young ex-military jock subversive infiltrator as their First “Continental U.S. Marshal”.

Mr Spring testified how the group of Constitutionals had Issued a “Deluge of Documents” against corrupted Holders of Public-Offices.

Mr Spring accused Charlene of advocating that the group Kidnap her ex-husband.

The recording that was played before the Jury had many blank sections which sounded as though the recordings had been edited.

Mr Spring took an Oath affirming that he sought the “Truth”.

Mr Spring’s court testimony was temporarily interrupted, in order to allow ex Judicial Office holder Karolyn Moore to testify during a convenient time-frame for her.

<Page 6>:

Ninth Witness: Karolyn Moore: Maiden-Name “Quigly”.

Ms Moore was not elected but was Appointed as a “County Judge”, in Boulder County, in 2011; and she retired from that position in January of 2019, and prior to her testimony here.

Prosecutors directed Ms Moore to testify about her interactions with one “Charlene Von Schlesien”; who was active with the group of Constitutionalist who were associated with Goodman.

Ms Moore testified that Ms Von Schlesien had refused to appear and surrender her-self for jail as previously stipulated; and that there-under, Ms Moore felt a public service duty to issue a “Warrant for Arrest” of Charlene Von Schlesien.

During the appearances of Ms Von Schlesien in court, many concerned members of the community usually appeared with her; all of which un-nerved Ms Moore.

Ms Moore testified that she had never before seen any such document as the group’s “Writ of

Mandamus for Ouster”, as was issued against Ms Moore; & that she there-under considered to to be without merit, and she ignored it, and refused to respond to the allegations contained there-in.

Ms Moor falsely testified that there are only two ways to re-consider such six-person jury convictions as was rendered against Ms Von Schlesien in Ms Moore’s court; and that was through “Motion to Re-Consider” before the same judge; or else through the normal civil/municipal governmental “Appeal Process”.

Various Liens were filed by the group of Colorado Constitutionalists, as against Ms Moore; one of them totaling \$189-Million, and another totaling \$821-Million.

In the text of the Writ that was issued against Ms Moore, there existed argument that Ms Moore had exercised her Judicial Office “Improperly”. Other wording there-in, and in related documents from the same group, caused Ms Moore to testify that she was “Shocked” by the outrage expressed against her; and that “often-times people do not agree” with her judgments, with the implication that she expected people to just quietly accept perceived injustices through her due-process violating summary/military six-person defacto-jury-assisted rulings. Ms Moore admitted the Jury which facilitated Charlene’s conviction, only contained “six people”, which is clearly a Violation of Constitutional “Due Process of Law”, at least in the eyes of all people competent to comprehend how “Due Process of Law” is Constitutionally Defined .

The issue was raised, likely by Mr Goodman in cross-examination; that, the Statute under which Ms Von Schlesien was allegedly convicted, had been “Repealed”. Ms Moore testified, in essence, that such factors are irrelevant, largely because those sorts of events usually just mean that the statute was merely “Re-Numbered”, and moved to a different section of the Colorado Code.

Prosecutor Shapiro focused on the concern about “Lawfully Seated Judges”; and he asked Ms Moore: “Was there any Violation of Law in the Conviction of Charlene Von Schlesien?”.

From this authors memory, Ms Moore falsely and maliciously answered that there was No such Violation of Law.

Prosecutor Shapiro pulled heart-strings of Jurors by whining about the stresses in the personal life of this public-servant, “Karolyn Moore”, all as the result of this encounter; but there was no such reasonable opportunity to draw-out the issue of the completely lawless any un-justified and un-conscionable stresses in the personal live of the member of the sovereign public people, “Charlene Von Schlesien”, as the direct result of this very same encounter.

Prosecutor Shapiro and Ms Moore whined about the “Liens” that were filed against Moore’s real-property; and also because of the fact that the home residence address of this otherwise un-accountable judicial officer had been discovered by these concerned members of the public. Ms | Moore whined as she testified that these concerned members of the public “scared me so much, they knew where I lived”, and that “my daughter was scared and crying”, and that “my daughter had anxiety”, and that “I was scared”.

Ms Moore testified further that the “Fidelity ...” Collection Agency which the Constitutionalists has secured the services of “Looked like a Bona Fide Corporation”.

Ms Moore testified that she had tried to structure her judicial options in manners which allowed people whom she had summarily convicted of crimes, and including specifically here “Charlene Von Schlesien”, to have plenty of reasonable opportunities to become “Productive Members of Society”.

On cross-examination, Mr Goodman seems also to have pressed the important issue of Why Common Public People are Not Allowed to Directly File and Prosecute “Criminal Complaints” against “Corrupted Public-Servants”.

Ms Moore’s only response to this obvious injustice and un-fairness was that “Only the Executive Branch can Bring Criminal Charges”.

<Page 7>: 2019-January-10; Thursday.

During opening comments, Larry Goodman accused Judge Spear of un-fairly “Changing the Starting-Date of the Trial”, from January 14 to January-7; all of which allegedly caused Mr Goodman to lose precious time in composing his preparations for the trial. Both Judge Spear and Prosecutor Shapiro solemnly affirmed that the Start-Date of the Trial was originally set during the 2018-August-27 hearing to start precisely on “January 7<sup>th</sup>”, and that Mr Goodman was “in error”, in his accusation against Judge Spear, on that point.

Mr Goodman asked Judge Spear to allow Admission in-to Evidence the book by “Hartford Van Dyke” which is entitled as the “Right to Keep and Bear Liens”. Larry also asked that Mr Van Dyke be allowed to appear in these court proceedings through “Phone Conference”, as an “Expert Witness”.

Judge Spear “Denied” Both of these requests.

Larry asked Judge Spear if he was familiar with the computer program called “Audacity”.

Judge Spear said he was not going to talk about such issues with Larry in front of the Jury.

Eighth Witness: Marshall Spring: (re-appearing, to continue interrupted testimony).

The secretive Recordings, which were subversively obtained by Mr Spring from the Colorado Constitutionals group, were resumed being played before the Jury.

Constitutionalists recorded there-in could be heard saying that “Insurance does Not Cover Crimes” committed by holders of Public-Offices; all of which is in bold-faced opposition to the arguments presented by the Prosecution in this case, to the effect that the Legislative Assembly had legitimately “Replaced the Constitutional ‘Bond’ Requirement” with these statutorily approved “Insurance Policies”.

Spring further alleged that Mr Goodman had advocated the “Kidnapping” of Judge Kern.

At the direction of FBI Agent Ryan English, Mr Spring was sent in to also infiltrate the Oregon movement and stand-off at the Malheur Wildlife Refuge.

Tenth Witness: Cindy Dominico:

Ms Dominico is a Boulder County Commissioner, who trusted “County Attorneys” to inform her whether or not any of her activities were “Criminal”, as the Colorado Constitutionals group had been alleging. Ms Dominico inferred that because the County Attorneys told her that her activities were Not Criminal, that she presumed that was a true statement, and that she could just continue on with her same behavior, without any regard for massive numbers of constituents protesting that their Constitutionally guaranteed rights were being violated.

On cross-examination, Larry asked Ms Dominico why no reasonable opportunity was allowed for the constituents of the county to explain the full merits of their concerns.

Judge Spear declared that he was not going to “compel” the witness to answer questions.

<Page 8>:

Eleventh Witness: Joseph Pelle, Boulder County Sheriff.

Prosecutor Shapiro asked Mr Pelle to share his views about the “Sovereign Sheriff’s Movement”.

Mr Pelle said that the only way to bring Criminal Complaints in the courts of Colorado is through the office of the prosecuting attorney.

Mr Pelle discussed the Constitutionalist group’s efforts get help with enforcement of their Liens through the company called “Fidelity Information Corporation”.

Mr Goodman cross-examined Pelle, by asking him about the Rights of Charlene to “Habeas Corpus” process. Larry followed up by confronting Pelle about the failure of his Deputies to provide

reasonable care for the prisoners. Issues raised here included the death of “Stephanie Anderson”, and Larry’s own first-hand testimony about the jail cells being very cold.

Pelle postured as being open to hearing grievances, because he had participated in discussions with supporters of “Sheriff Mack”; and he affirmed that he makes himself available to constituents “by appointment”.

Witness Twelve: Alfred Harrell, Denver County Judge.

Mr Harrell’s testimony was short with no noteworthy conversation being noted.

Witness 13: Rayna Bayas.

Ms Bayas is a Deputy Boulder County District Attorney; she is from Los Angeles, and she claims honorable activism in fighting against “Human Trafficking”, aka the secretive and criminally-syndicated selling of human slaves.

Ms Bayas was the prosecutor in the case of “Charlene Von Schlesien”; and Ms Bayas affirmed that Charlene had Refused to Appear in Court when Charlene had been lawfully summoned to appear.

On cross-examination from Mr Goodman, and in the context of the Constitution and Statutes which govern the procedures in the Courts of Colorado; Ms Bayas confidently declared, that, Private Citizens do Not have any lawful Authority to directly Prosecute Criminal Complaints, either for themselves, or for their friends or associates. At this point, I, Charles Stewart, did rick a ‘Contempt of Court’ citation, by loudly prompting Mr Goodman to follow-up on that bold proclamation by Ms Bayas, by asking “Why?”.

Prosecutor Shapiro immediately interrupted by asking Judge Spear to prohibit me from assisting Mr Goodman; and this line of follow-up to Ms Bayas’s bold declarations was never further explored. Ms Bayas provided no citations to Colorado’s Constitution or Statutes in support of her bold claim.

Ms Bayas did confidently proclaim that there was a real natural-person corpus-delecti “Victim” in her prosecution of the case of “Charlene Von Schlesien”; and that Victim was the Son of Ms Von Schlesien.

Prosecutor Shapiro declared that governing Law mandates that “No Recordings” of the proceedings in this Court Case were to be allowed for the Public; and Judge Spear affirmed those words as being true.

Witness 14: Kathrine Kirk.

Ms Kirk is a Denver Deputy District Attorney, under Beth McCann.

On cross-examination, Mr Goodman nicely pressed Ms Kirk about whether or not Common Members of the Public, Constituents, have the Right to Prosecute their own Criminal Complaints. Ms Kirk declared clearly that Common People do Not have any such right.

Presiding Judge Spear obstructed Larry’s efforts at pressing this issue, because, it was an “Issue of Law”, which he (Spear) alone allegedly had lawful authority to monopolize in that court-room.

Judge Spear here-in also declared that “Law” is So Voluminous, that it is “Incomprehensible” for average Constituent/Members of the Public in Colorado.

Witness 15: Patrick Firman:

Mr Firman presently holds the office of the “Denver County Sheriff”.

Mr Firman received many of the documents from the Colorado Constitutionalists group as have been discussed in this case. Mr Firman affirmed that he was “Not Sure” of the Legal Significance of these documents; and that he forwarded them to the City/County Attorney.

Mr Firman declared that his Sheriff's Department only performs "Incarcerations"; and that they perform "No Patrol Functions", & that they just allow the "City Police" to handle all of that.

Witness 16: Ms Troutman. (First name did not get noted. Her maiden-name was "Owen".)

Ms Troutman is an "Assistant Denver City Attorney". Ms Troutman researched the validity of the "Liens" which the Colorado Constitutionals group was using in their efforts to obtain accountability from Public Servants. Deputy Prosecutor Stockley characterized the group's efforts here as their presumption that they could reduce honest public servants to "Lawful Prey".

<Page 10>; 2019-January-11

As the morning of this new day opened, presiding Judge Spear informed those in attendance in the Court, that, one of the Jurors had written a note to him, complaining that the only two of Mr Goodman's supporters in the room (mostly), had allegedly traumatized at least a few Jurors, just by the way that we were looking at them with a bit of intense concern, about their role in honorably securing the sacred cause of "Justice" for our friend. That same Juror wrote in that same note, that, he/she believed that Mr Goodman's only other obvious supporter, besides this author, one "Brian Loma", was using his laptop computer in the courtroom to "Record" what was being discussed in this supposedly "Open and Public Court" proceeding.

Judge Spear nicely responded by declaring that he was not going to micro-manage how people observing Court procedures look at Jurors; and he gave a copy of that note to Mr Goodman, which we have in our records. Judge Spear further affirmed that he was honestly attempting to run that Court in conformity with Constitutional Mandates that such proceedings be both "Open" and "Public". Judge Spear also then affirmed, that, he was going to call in a secretive executive-officer, to watch closely from behind Brian Loma, if Brian might re-appear in these Court proceedings, and perhaps dare to attempt to actually "Record" these supposedly "Open and Public Court" proceedings.

Testimony then continued from the previous day, from Ms Troutman.

Mr Goodman opened with cross-examination of Ms Troutman.

Ms Troutman confidently declared that: "Liens have been found 'Invalid' by the Court".

(This author here noted, that, many of these Jurors seem to have become Retarded and Mind-Controlled, in their otherwise natural ability to comprehend the 'Natural Law' Principles, up-on which Mr Goodman was here-in making his arguments.)

Ms Troutman continued on to confidently declare, that, the "Criminal Complaints" of these Constitutionalist/Patriots were "Not Valid".

Ms Troutman further declared that the Commercial Notes of Hartford Van Dyke were 'Counterfeit'. Mr Goodman pressed Ms Troutman nicely on 'Why' she made such as bold statement.

Ms Troutman's only response, was that, a single/individual Denver Judge from municipal provisional jurisdiction, had summarily declared that Hartford's notes were "Not Valid".

Municipal Judge Spear spoke words which inferred that Mr Goodman's line of questioning on this point was "Wasteful of the Jury's Time".

Mr Goodman courageously continued by pressing Ms Troutman yo answer Why, if normal 'Checks' are 'Valid', then Why are Hartford's Notes any less 'Valid'?

Ms Troutman effectively evaded answering that question; but through further questioning she admitted that she had provided an Affidavit of her sworn testimony that Hartford's Notes were "Spurious".



<Page 11>:

FBI Agent English returned to the witness stand; and he testified that this group of Colorado Constitutionlists were “Not Forming ‘Real Grand Juries’”.

Witness 17: Kimberly Kern.

Ms Kern is a Judicial Officer who has been Provisionally Appointed to her Judicial Office by representatives of the Municipal Government of the State of Colorado. Ms Kern holds her Judicial Office in Pueblo County.

Ms Kern admitted that she had Failed to properly File her “Oath of Office”.

A Constitutionlist named “Marshal” apparently organized quite a Protest in Ms Kern’s Court-room, over a “Family Rights Issue”. Ms Kern declared that her words and actions towards Mr Marshal were all in her honest efforts to get Mr Marshal to be “Reasonable”.

Ms Kern confidently declared that legitimate judicial process allows for single individual appointed Judge, such as her-self, to summarily adjudicate that some individual Liens are “Spurious”.

Mr Goodman asked Ms Kern if the conflicts in the Court-room over which she presided were with a man who is more fully named as “Michael Marshal Williams”. (My notes do not indicate that this question was answered.)

As the direct result of the words and actions of these Constitutionlists, Ms Kern further declared, that, “We are Afraid”; and that she and others in her jurisdiction felt so afraid as to prompt them to take steps which “Heightened Security” for her home and surroundings.

Mr Goodman further and pointedly pressed Ms Kern on these issues; by asking “Why did you Not try to Talk with these People?”; and “Why did you Not try to Reason with them?”.

No clear answer to these pivotal questions were forth-coming from Ms Kern; and Prosecutor Shapiro attempted to shift the focus of the subject that Larry was raising here, by assigning fault to those claiming to be criminally ‘Victimized’ by Ms Kern’s Corrupted Judicial Rulings. Prosecutor Shapiro here focused emphatically on the cumbersome municipal judicial process for “Filing an Appeal” in the “Appellate Court”, and/or the Supreme Court, of the municipal government of Colorado. Prosecutor Shapiro here further assigned blame to these Constitutionlists, because they had not chosen to use that provisional, cumbersome, expensive, and obstructive process. Mr Shapiro here postured with a straight-face, as being profoundly perplexed, about, how freedom loving Americans could possibly consider this grand scheme of judicial accountability under their municipal form of government, could possibly be considered by any reasonable person as failing to effectively meet all of the legitimate needs for ‘Justice’, for the common People of Colorado.

Witness 18: “Debra Eyler”:

Ms Eyler claims legitimate authority to exercise Judicial Powers from the municipal government of Colorado, as to be applied to those common People who reside with-in that provisional government’s “Tenth Judicial District”. Ms Eyler claims to be the legitimate “Chief Judge” of this “Tenth Judicial District”.

Ms Eyler admitted that she “Refused to Reply” to the numerous “Notice of Fraud” and similar documents, which Mr Goodman and the other Colorado Constitutionlists had sent to her and many other similar people, all of whom claimed legitimate right to hold “Public Offices”.

<Page 12>: Testimony of Debra Eyler, continued:

In follow-up cross-examination, Mr Goodman nicely pressed Ms Eyler about her “Refusal to Reply” to these many serious legal documents sent to her and others; by asking Ms Eyler if she knew of the legal “Doctrine of Acquiescence”, which authorizes concerned parties to obtain what amounts to

a “Judgement by Default”, as against people who have Duties to Respond to the documents being sent to them.

Effectively; Ms Eyler’s only answer to this line of inquiry from Mr Goodman, was that she had Refused to Respond to those documents, because, she had summarily and personally decided that these documents were “Invalid”.

FBI Agent Ryan English again took the witness stand.

Agent English testified in support of municipal Judge Spear allowing many documents from the Prosecutor’s Office to be Admitted in-to the Court Record.

Witness 19: James Petrock:

Mr Petrock is an appointed holder of the Public Office of the “Gilpin County Attorney”; he specializes in legal knowledge concerning “Local Government” rights and privileges.

Mr Petrock told numerous other holders of Public Offices in Gilpin County, to “Ignore” the many “Notice of Fraud” and related documents that were being sent by local Constitutionlists to them; because, he had personally and summarily concluded that they were “Bogus”, “Gibberish”, and “Mumbo-Jumbo”.

Mr Petrock admitted to having sent a letter to Gilpin County Treasurer Hoffman; where-in he directed Treasurer Hoffman to just “Ignore” these many “Notice of Fraud” and related documents that were being sent by local Constitutionlists, to Hoffman and many other Public Servants.

Mr Petrock whined profusely in his testimony, that, this letter of his directing Treasurer Hoffman to “Ignore” these many local and popular concerns about “Fraud” being committed under color of governmental authority, had been Shared or Leaked to the public, and to the complaining parties.

Mr Petrock admitted that he knew what “CUSIP Numbers” were.

<https://www.investopedia.com/ask/answers/what-is-a-cusip-number/>

Mr Petrock whined because local Constitutionlists had investigated his back-ground, and they had subpoenaed his law school records.

Mr Petrock affirmed that Mr Goodman had claimed that Mr Goodman’s Home was Not Subject to local “Gilpin County Property Tax”.

Mr Petrock admitted that the numerous “Notice of Fraud” and related documents that had been sent by local Constitutionlists, were ‘causing him serious frustration’, and that “County Commissioners business was becoming seriously Obstructed” by these activities.

Mr Petroch whined that he just “Wanted Closure” for all of these problems; even though he was actively obstructing open communications with the very members of the public who were sounding these alarms about an epidemic of “Fraud” in local Gilpin County government.

<Page 13>: Witness 20: “Kirk M. Taylor”.

Mr Taylor is an ‘ex Deputy District Attorney’; and he currently holds the Public Office of “Pueblo County Sheriff”.

Prosecutor Shapiro opened with words implying some great harm to the interests of the Public, through Damage to the “Reputation” of Mr Taylor; all as the result of Mr Taylor’s “Failure to Respond” to the many “Notice of Fraud” and related documents, that had been served on him and others, by concerned members of the local community; and that along with the consequent “Escalation” that naturally followed in the words and tone of the continuing stream of paper-work from local concerned constituents.

Mr Taylor agreed with Prosecutor Shapiro, that, Mr Taylor's "Reputation" had been unjustifiably and un-fairly Damaged. At Mr Shapiro's further prompt; Mr Taylor further described how many local "Judicial Officers" of their same municipal ideology and limited jurisdiction judicial franchise, had all allegedly become "Fearful", as the direct result of the consequent "Escalation" that naturally followed from their "Failure to Respond"; all as flowing through the words and tone of the continuing stream of paper-work from local concerned constituents.

Mr Taylor confidently proclaimed that the "Superior Court of Colorado", as established by the group of Colorado Constitutionals here in question, did "Not Exist".

Mr Taylor further complained of an alleged 'lack of justification and fairness', in the "Liens" which the group of local Colorado Constitutionals had filed against him; all as the direct result of his "Failure to Respond" to the many "Notice of Fraud" and related documents that had been sent to him and others of similar municipal ideology and franchise.

Mr Goodman pressed Mr Taylor on the issue, that, Pueblo County Commissioners do not respect Goodman's concern that they are Constitutionally Required to be "Bonded"; and that instead they Contract with an entity with the abbreviated acronym of "CTSI", who provides for them a replacement mechanism of "County Insurance".

Mr Goodman also pressed Mr Taylor on whether or not Mr Taylor had properly filed his own official "Oath and Bond".

Witness 21: "Jeffrey Costner".

Mr Costner is a District Attorney in Pueblo County, Colorado; he is Ex Air-Force, an Ex-Military Lawyer, and Ex Military 'Advocate General'.

Mr Costner complained of an alleged 'lack of justification and fairness', in the "Liens" which the group of local Colorado Constitutionals had filed against him; all as the direct result of his "Failure to Respond" to the many "Notice of Fraud" and related documents that had been sent to him and others of similar municipal ideology and franchise. He also complained that this same group of Constitutionals had pointedly attempted to Remove him from the Public Office which he holds.

FBI Agent English again took the witness stand.

Agent English described how he also is a Member of the "Connecticut Bar Association" of state licensed attorneys. In follow-up cross-examination from Mr Goodman; Agent English evaded pointed questions implying criminal anti-trust monopolies over the Courts by such "Bar Associations"; but Agent English did admit that the entire community which so profoundly affects the administration of Justice in our nations Courts, called the "American Bar Association", is no more than a "Private Club".

<Page 14> 2019-January-15; Tuesday.

On Monday, the 14<sup>th</sup> of January; Trial proceedings had been scheduled to resume in this case.

However; Mr Goodman had then "Fallen Ill", and early that morning he left his apartment to check-in to local Hospital "Emergency Care".

This resulted in both this author and Mr Goodman missing all court proceedings that took place on this Monday the 14<sup>th</sup>.

On Tuesday Morning; Court discussion opened which focused on the fact that Mr Goodman had "Not Appeared" for Court proceedings which had been previously scheduled for Monday.

One Adams County "Deputy Shay Haney" opened by submitting testimony, that, he had appeared at Mr Goodman's apartment on Monday afternoon, with a "Arrest Warrant" which had been issued against Mr Goodman, by Judge Spear, for Mr Goodman's "Failure to Appear" in Court, as had

been previously scheduled for Monday. Mr Haney had referenced that he was working with the FBI, and there-under was also working with a local “Joint Terrorism Task Force”.

As Mr Goodman had earlier Monday morning requested of me, this author had dutifully called Judge Spear’s chambers, to inform his clerk or bailiff, that, Mr Goodman was ill; and that Mr Goodman had checked-in to local Hospital “Emergency Care”, and that these developments had obstructed Mr Goodman’s ability to attend the Courts scheduled trial proceedings.

I did then give Judge Spear’s clerk the cell-phone number for Mr Goodman.

In Tuesday morning’s discussion; Judge Spear affirmed that his clerk had properly received my messages; and that his clerk had tried to call Mr Goodman through his cell-phone; but that Mr Goodman did not answer that call; and that Mr Goodman had failed to properly set-up the messaging service that was connected to his cell-phone; and there-under Judge Spear’s clerk could not even leave Mr Goodman any message about the “Warrant” that Judge Spear was then seriously considering issuing for Mr Goodman’s arrest.

Judge Spear further indicated in his words here, that, the “Ankle Tracker” device which was attached to Mr Goodman’s ankle, had generated data which “Contradicted” some of the words which Deputy Haney had declared that this author, Charles Stewart, had spoken to Deputy Haney.

During a break; I asked Prosecutor Shapiro if those allegations from Judge Spear and Mr Haney were “True”; and Prosecutor Shapiro simply and guardedly declared that his office would investigate whether or not this author had actually broken any laws, as the result of my efforts at assisting Mr Goodman to secure lawful Justice.

Witness 22: “David Coffelt”.

Early in the history of the Colorado Constitutionals group, Mr Coffelt had become an active member of the group. Mr Coffelt here testified that he and his wife had a bad experience working in a gambling casino, or the “gaming industry”, and had sought remedy through normal Civil Court procedures. Mr Coffelt had become so angry with his previous employers at the casino, that later here-in he testified that he had been seeking a “Vendetta” against them.

Mr Coffelt also testified that he had sincerely believed that his complaints in the courts of the civil government did Not produce for him a “Fair Trial”; and that with his implication that the Judicial Officers associated there-in Knew that they did Not produce a “Fair Trial” for Mr Coffelt, and that with the further implication that Mr Coffelt had then come to believe that those Civil Judicial Officers simply just did “Not Care” about producing “Fair Trials” for any of Colorado’s common People.

These were the cold and hard realities of what Mr Coffelt had come to believe was a completely corrupted Civil Judicial System; all of which early on drove Mr Coffelt to become associated with this group of Colorado Constitutionals; as that group seemed to offer the only possible chance for actually finding some sort of Objective “Justice” for not only his personal complaints, but also for the many others associated with the group who were voicing similar credible grievances .

But that small number of bar-member attorneys who claim to possess lawful monopoly over the right to prosecute criminal complaints in Colorado and Denver County had arrested Mr Coffelt for his activities with the group, and there-under they seemingly have completely Terrorized him in-to abandoning his constitutionally guaranteed rights to “Due Process of Law”; and they pressured him to enter in-to what they term as a “Plea Agreement”, where-under Mr Coffelt agreed to ‘Change Sides’ against his previous fellow Constitutionalist-Patriots, and to testify that other more principled members of the group, including him-self, had actually committed some sort of a legitimately recognizable “Crime”.

The Tone of Mr Coffelt's Voice was notably "High Pitched"; which this author took to indicate that he was under tremendous pressure from the Prosecutors to compromise his principles and to testify against his previous group associates. Mr Coffelt here-under testified that the Colorado Constitutionalists group had devolved in-to becoming lawlessly "Vindictive"; and that collectively, they had un-reasonably "caused a ruckus in the court" proceedings, of at least one court case.

Mr Coffelt went on to testify that he held one "John Darash" of a similar New-York based group called the "National Liberty Alliance" in some sort of high regard, and that Mr Darash has clearly informed Mr Goodman and the other leading members of the Colorado Constitutionalists group to Avoid filing any "Liens" on corrupted public servants. Mr Coffelt testified that Mr Goodman was clearly "knowledgable" of this supposedly profound advise from Mr Darash.

<https://www.nationallibertyalliance.org/>

Mr Coffelt testified further, that, he had met with group members in Mr Goodman's home "about 40 times"; and as time went on he and Mr Goodman began developing some serious and fundamental dis-agreements.

<Page 15> David Coffelt Testimony, continued.

At Prosecutor Shapiro's lead, Mr Coffelt testified that the Colorado Constitutionalists group has began to seek a form of Personal/Private "Retaliation", as opposed to the "Public Justice" interests which the group members has insisted was their true goal.

Prosecutor Shapiro then directed Mr Coffelt to discuss the Case of "Charlene Von Schlesien". Mr Coffelt then testified that the group members involved in that case were writing and speaking "Mumbo Jumbo", and this authors notes indicate that the group members were then conversely accusing Civil Judicial Officers of speaking "Mumbo Jumbo"

At Prosecutor Shapiro's direction, Mr Coffelt accused Mr Goodman of seeking his own personal/private "Vendetta"; as opposed to the "Public Justice" agenda that Mr Goodman and the vast majority of other group members claimed that they were attempting to pursue.

Mr Goodman attempted to counter these accusations by citing the federal case-law entitled "U.S. vs Williams", where-in was recognized that the common People in America have the Right to "Form Their Own Grand-Juries", and to there-under bring criminal complaints against solemnly affirmed and accused corrupted public-servants.

Prosecutor Shapiro "Objected" to Mr Goodman's citation of this case-law, based on a previous ruling from Civil Judge Spear, where-under Judge Spear had ruled that a number of issues related to this case would not be allowed to be presented to the Jury, or "Limited"; and this including issues related to this "U.S. vs Williams" case; all under Judge Spears formal approval of Prosecutor Shapiro's submission to the District Court of what they describe as a "Motion in Limine".

<https://dictionary.law.com/Default.aspx?selected=1291>

This author has studied the ancient sources of the specific course of step-by-step "Procedures", which are involved in Anglo/American Constitutional "Due Process of Law", and the accompanying fact that, following this "Due Process" is Required in order for the convening of a legitimate "Court of Law", "Court of Justice", or "Court of Record". Here-under; I have become painfully aware that presiding Civil Judge Michael Spear is Not running any form of a legitimate "Court of Law", "Court of Justice", or "Court of Record"; but rather he is facilitating this prosecution of Mr Goodman under some sort of a secretive and "Star Chamber" like quasi "Military Tribunal", where-under these sorts of "Summary Judgement" types of activities are perversely considered to be in the "Public Interest".

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Star\\_Chamber](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Star_Chamber)

During Mr Coffelt's testimony, the assertion was made by either Mr Coffelt or Mr Goodman, that, the Only Response received from any Public Office holders to all of the "Notice of Fraud" and related documents that they had sent out, was from a single Public Office holder in Gilpin County.

Mr Goodman argued that the Prosecutor's Office was exercising "Selective Prosecution", in their Prosecuting this group of Colorado Constitutionalists; because, they had Refused to Prosecute any of the multitudes of Criminal Complaints against sworn accused Criminally Corrupted Public-Servants, all of which they had been presented with by this group of Colorado Constitutionalists.

Mr Goodman raised the issue to Mr Coffelt, that, everyone in the Colorado group had seemed to comprehend that the "Commercial Instruments" which had been issued by one "Hartford Van Dyke" in this case, were "Legitimate", under the very ancient and international form of "Commercial Law".

Prosecutor Shapiro promptly spoke words which attempted to attack the "Credibility" of Mr Van Dyke; by alleging that the "Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals" had Affirmed that the Commercial Instruments which were manufactured and put in-to circulation by Mr Van Dyke were "Fictitious Obligations", and that Mr Van Dyke's Conviction had been there-in affirmed that Mr Van Dyke had broken laws codified under the "United States Code" as at "18 U.S.C. 371".

This author has spoken about this specific point with Mr Van Dyke, since the conclusion of this trial; and Mr Van Dyke has solemnly affirmed to me that he has Not been Lawfully "Convicted" of any such "Crime" as that which Prosecutor Shapiro has here alleged.

Witness 23: "Keith Heavlin".

Mr Heavlin is a Boulder County Deputy Sheriff; who resided previously in Washington State, and who has had a Federal Military "Top Secret Clearance", and who has history with "Army Intelligence", "Special Forces", "Northrop" corporation, and "Swat Teams". Mr Heavlin modernly specializes in "Computer Security" and "Transportation Security".

Mr Heavlin testified that he had been Recruited to "Infiltrate" the group of Colorado Constitutionalists; and that they had been informed of Mr Heavlin's extensive military background, but that they had presumed that military background to not be a serious threat of "Infiltration", and they misguidedly went ahead and actually invited this infiltrator to assume a prominent role in their group as one of their "Grand Jury Administrators".

<Page 16>: Keith Heavlin testimony, continued:

Mr Heavlin testified that he and other group members has met weekly at Mr Goodman's home for over four months. Mr Heavlin attempted to draw Mr Goodman's competence into question, by testifying that Mr Goodman's sentences were frequently "Disjointed". Mr Heavlin further testified that the group was "Vindictive" in pursuing their own private and personal interests, and that with his clear implication that there was No "Interest of Public Justice" motivating the group.

Instead of challenging Mr Heavlin's most serious accusation that the group was pursuing their own personal and private interests by being "Vindictive"; Mr Goodman shifted away from that accusation by asking Mr Heavlin about his "Military Oath", and about the "Public Office Oath" of the numerous holders of Public Officers who had received the many "Notice of Fraud" and related documents, including Colorado's State Treasurer.

Prosecutor Shapiro "Objected" to the line of questioning from Mr Goodman, which sought to draw into question the "Oath of Office" of such Public Office holders as the State Treasurer; because, Prosecutor Shapiro alleged that such argument was "Irrelevant" to the merits of the complaints then before the court.

Presiding Civil Judge Spear "Sustained" that Objection from Prosecutor Shapiro.

Mr Goodman did nicely confront Mr Heavlin about the related issues of “Slavery” and “Peonage”; about which Mr Goodman prompted a response from Mr Heavlin about how those words and concepts differed significantly from our Original American Constitutional concept of the “Sovereignty” of our American People

In the opinion of this author; while Mr Goodman does have some good talent in composing documents, he is not a skilled verbal communicator, especially in these sorts of formal court-room settings. There-under; Presiding Civil Judge Spear Limited many of Mr Goodman’s honest attempts to draw-out important points, by dictating to Mr Goodman that he could “Not Engage in Conversation with the Witness”, in Mr Goodman’s attempts to draw-out these important points.

Mr Goodman asked Mr Heavlin if Mr Heavlin had voted for Donald Trump to be president.

Mr Goodman nicely confronted Mr Heavlin about his signing documents in which he represented to the group that Mr Heavlin was joined with the group in their Mutual Goals of Seeking “Public Justice” for the common People of Colorado, and which included addressing openly and responsibly the related and very real problem with “Government Accountability”.

Mr Goodman went on to nicely draw out the point that Mr Heavlin had been Deceiving this Community of Honest People, to the effect that Mr Heavlin represented to them that he was sympathetic and supportive of both their goals and tactics; when the sad reality was, that, Mr Heavlin was nothing less than I hired “Mercenary”, sent in to Destroy the Group, all without giving their members any realistic or meaningful opportunity to have their many grievances and formal criminal complaints responsibly addressed by any public official.

In response to this powerful line of questioning from Mr Goodman; Prosecutor Shapiro drew out the affirmation from Mr Heavlin, that, Mr Heavlin had Only been instructed to “Not Lie to the FBI”, all with the clear implication that, apparently, under their system, it was “Ok to Lie” to everyone else, including the members of this targeted group of Colorado Constitutionalists.

<Page 17> Witness 24: “J. Eric Ellif”.

Mr Ellif holds the Civil Public Office of a “Judge” of the Second Judicial District” in Colorado, all in the general area of “Denver County”. Civil Judge Ellif testified that he accepted the taking of a case alleging that a specific “Lien” from this group of Colorado Constitutionalists was “Spurious”, and of no legitimate legal significance, and void. All by his own initiative, and without complying with the Requirement of Constitutional “Due Process”; Civil Judge Ellif decided to adjudicate this case Without the involvement of any Lawfully Required “Jury”, and also apparently without even specifying in support of his Decision, the “Reasons Why” he had made his decision. Judge Ellif did go through the motions of colorably adjudicating this Lien to be “Spurious”, and of no legitimate legal significance, and void.

Mr Ellif further testified, that, when the co-defendant in this case Steven Nulty presumed to seek Remedy against Civil Judge Ellif, because of Judge Ellif’s un-lawfully declaring the group’s first lien to be “spurious” and void; Nulty filed another Lien directly against Judge Ellif. Mr Ellif testified further that he decided that this second Lien against him from Nulty was “Gibberish”.

Mr Goodman followed with cross-examination which pointedly asked Mr Ellif if his Judicial Decisions on these issues, were based on his knowledge of the “Necessary Elements of a Lien”.

Mr Ellif refused to describe the “Necessary Elements of Liens”, but he did respond by alleging that there was “No Contract” in place, which could have caused him to incur any legitimate debt to the Lien Claimant, who was Mr Nulty.

Mr Goodman countered by asking Mr Ellif if an “Oath of Office” could legitimately be considered to be a “Contract with the People”.

Mr Ellif responded by confidently declaring, that, an “Oath of Office is Not a Contract”.

Mr Goodman countered that declaration, by asking Mr Ellif about the Maxim-of-Law that “Silence is Acquiescence”, at least when people have Duties to answer reasonable questions, as is the case with all “Public Servants”. Mr Goodman pointed out that such Silence amounts to an “Admission by Default” from the Public Servant so questioned, and regarding the claims or accusations presented in the document, and all of which includes “Debts” owed by Public Servants who contemptuously Refuse to Answer Reasonable Questions from Constituent Members of the Public.

Mr Ellif’s only related response to these arguments from Mr Goodman, was that: “There is Nothing to Respond To”.

Mr Goodman here-in argued even further that Presiding Civil Judge Spear had similarly “Defaulted” in response to Mr Goodman’s challenges to Judge Spear’s “Jurisdiction” to try this case.

Presiding Judge Spear responded by confidently declaring, that, “The Court has Jurisdiction, at this point”.

Witness 25: David John Rogers.

Mr Rogers is a “Crime Analyst” in the “Boulder County Sheriff’s Department”.

Mr Rogers testified about the accuracy of the many video and audio recordings which the Prosecution was presenting in this case.

<Page 18> Witness 26: “Stanley L. Garnett”.

Mr Garnett testified that he has worked in the past as a Deputy District Attorney in Denver County’, and that he presently holds the Civil Public Office of “Boulder County District Attorney”.

Under the authority of the Boulder County District Attorney’s Office, which Mr Garnett then held; the Criminal Accusation against “Charlene Von Schlesien” was Prosecuted.

Mr Garnett confidently declared, at least twice, that, Ms Von Schlesien “Got a Fair Trial”; and he similarly declared, at least once, that she got “Due Process of Law”.

Mr Garnett testified that many of the documents and calls from many members of the Colorado Constitutionals group, indicated that they were quite “Angry” about his deciding to Criminally Accuse and Prosecute Ms Von Schlesien; and that, this case involving Ms Von Schlesien had drawn lots of attention in and around his Boulder County Prosecutor’s Office.

Mr Garnett further testified that the people who had composed these case related documents which were sent to his office and others, had put a lot of their own precious and limited time and energy into composing and serving those documents.

Mr Garnett further declared clearly that he did Not even Read most of those documents that were sent to him by these concerned members of the Public; because, he had summarily decided that all of those Complaints and Liens from all of those Concerned Members of the Public, amounted to nothing more than “Garbage”, “Nonsense”, and “Gibberish”; and that the essence of the Complaints and Accusations contained in those documents from members of the public were only “Imaginary”.

Mr Garnett went on to testify about how his allegedly victimized deputy prosecutor “Rayna Bayas” had suffered a lot of allegedly un-justified “Stress”; and how he and Ms Bayas both considered the later escalating versions of these documents to contain un-lawful “Threats” against them, and that those documents were both “Weird” and “Angry”.

Mr Garnett further testified that “it was not clear from the documents what the problem was”.

Mr Garnett continued his testimony, by declaring, that “They were trying to get me to de-rail the prosecution of Charlene”, and by inferring that the group’s commercial “Distress Bonds” were not



legitimate by saying: "... 'Distress Bond', what-ever that is."

Mr Garnett also declared that he had "No Idea what a 'De-Jure Court' is."

Mr Goodman nicely focused Mr Garnett to answer if he or others in his Prosecutor's Office, whether or not they took any steps at all in attempts to "Iron Things Out" with all of these many constituent members of the public who were proclaiming so loudly their complaints about un-fairness from the Prosecutor Garnett's Office.

Mr Garnett only meekly answered that he did Not "Try to Iron Things Out" with these many members of the complaining public.

Mr Goodman followed up by asking Mr Garnett if the tactics he was using amounted to him "Using Law-Enforcement as a Mercenary Army"; to which proposition Mr Garnett simply answered that it was not true.

When Mr Goodman focused attention on the Lien documents that the Colorado Constitutionals group had issued, Mr Garnett countered Larrys basic arguments by confidently declaring that the "Oath" of Office to the People of Colorado, from such Public Servants as he professes to be, does Not amount to a "Creditor/Debtor Relationship" between him/them and the general Public/People of Colorado; implicitly, even after they "Default" in non-response to questions from the Public about the Constitutional 'Duties' of those holders of Public Offices.

<Page 19> Sixth Witness: (appearing again): Chris Byrne:

Deputy Sheriff Byrne testified here about the authenticity of a Video recording, which was played before the Jury in this Court; and which Video displayed actions by between 5 and 10 members of the Public who had courageously marched into the Boulder County Sheriff's Office, and confronted Deputies there-in about the Habeas-Corpus and Due-Process Rights of their Prisoner, one "Charlene Von Schlesien".

Upon cross-examination from Mr Goodman, this discussion quickly broadened-out to include the Habeas-Corpus and Due-Process Rights of the other members of the Colorado Constitutionals group who were so courageously speaking-out against institutionalized governmental corruption.

Mr Goodman focused pointedly on the fact that Habeas-Corpus had been "Denied" for the eight other members of this group.

Deputy Byrne confidently declared that these people did Not have lawful authority or standing to Habeas-Corpus Demand the production of the body of the prisoner, "Charlene Von Schlesien". Mr Byrne followed this bold declaration, by declaring that, all such Habeas-Corpus process as this had to be issued by a "Legitimate Court"; and that such documents as had been thus-far issued by these concerned members of the public, had Not been issued by any such "Legitimate Court" as he was describing.

Mr Goodman pointedly countered by asking Mr Byrne if he was a "Lawyer"; to which Mr Byrne responded that he was "Not a Lawyer". Mr Byrne followed by confidently declaring that Charlene had been Sentenced to to Jail by a Lawful "Court of Record".

At this point, Presiding Civil Judge Spear confidently declared, effectively, that "Writs can Only be Issued by a Competent 'Court of Record'".

A bit later, Presiding Judge Spear commanded the Jury to "hold off on deliberations until I tell you it is ok".

<Page 20>: 2019-January-16; Wednesday.

Discussion here opened by Mr Goodman declaring to Presiding Civil Judge Spear, that, Mr Goodman desired for Judge Spear to direct the Sheriff's Deputies to give Mr Goodman access to his normal street clothes, not only so that Mr Goodman could have better chance to avoid the freezing cold

of the jail cell at night, but also so that Mr Goodman could appear in some dignified garb as the trial continued before the Jury.

A Deputy Sheriff's Captain in charge of such issues, initially 'Refused Judge Spear's Request' here. After Judge Spear honorably 'went up the chain of command' to higher authorities, Judge Spear was successful in getting the Sheriff's Department to release Mr Goodman's normal street-clothes to him.

Witness 27: "Harlan Albert Smith":

Mr Smith had been a Member in Good Standing with the group of Colorado Constitutionals who were related to this case involving Laurence Goodman. But after the arrests began happening, Mr Smith was subjected to enormous pressures from Prosecutor Shapiro's Office, to enter in-to a "Plea Agreement", where-in he was coerced into testifying against his previous compatriots. There-under; Mr Smith was coerced into submitting his person to "Mental-Health and Anger-Management" counseling from licensed professionals.

Mr Smith testified that Mr Goodman spent many hours in the Boulder Law Library, in Mr Goodman's vigilant efforts at (presumably) discovering how court related procedures might effectively be used to secure Justice for the common people.

In obvious risk of his "Plea Agreement" with the Prosecutors; Mr Smith courageously declared that the "Treatment by Sheriff's Deputies" in Boulder County, of their prisoner: "Charlene Von Schlesien", was "Outrageous".

However; under these pressures from the Prosecutor's Office, Mr Smith now testified that he has researched "the Liens used" by the Colorado Constitutionalist's group; and that, because he could not find any support for it through his research, he had more recently concluded that these Liens were "Not Valid".

Mr Smith went on to testify how the Professional "Collection Agency" that the group had hired, with the word "Fidelity ..." in their name; had been threatened by the Boulder County District Attorney's Office, to 'Stop Sending Out Collections Letters', on behalf of this group of Colorado Constitutionals.

Mr Smith went on to testify, as to his more current beliefs, that, the documents sent out by the Colorado Constitutionalist group's leaders, which indicated that accused public-servants who refused to honorably respond to such documents might be "Arrested", was a 'Stupid' choice-of-words. Mr Smith went on to testify that the groups leaders similar choice-of-words relating to accusations of 'Sedition', and 'Treason', were 'Not Reasonable'.

Prosecutor Shapiro suggested to Mr Smith that the Liens that the group had filed against their accused and defaulting public-servants, were "Retaliatory", and only in the private interests of individual group members who would have been feeding their own egos; but, Mr Smith honorably refused to endorse that proposition from Prosecutor Shapiro.

<Page 21>:

Mr Smith continued on to honorably declare that the "Motives" for this group of Colorado Constitutionals issuing these many "Notice of Fraud" and related documents, including the "Liens"; was "To Get Answers", from those other-wise cold-hearted and non-responsive holders of Public-Offices.

Mr Smith then laid more foundation for his testimony here, by testifying that "Everybody in the Group was Angry about Charlene's Imprisonment"; because, they all unitedly recognized that "Imprisonment" to be Un-Lawful, for numerous differing reasons.

Mr Smith went on to testify that “We Caused Problems for Public Officials”, whom the group had tried to communicate with about their grievances, but again were met with only cold-hearted indifference.

Under this pressure from the Prosecutors Office, Mr Smith testified “I Broke the Laws of the State of Colorado”. (How-ever; this author, is inclined to believe those words to be ‘false’; and only uttered under the tremendous coercive pressures that Mr Smith was then under. And I would be glad to be proven wrong here, if possible; in any truly open and public court proceedings, all of which did not occur in the proceedings of this secretive summary quasi-military tribunal.)

Mr Smith did courageously continue on with his testimony, by declaring, that, “The Public Officials Should have Responded to our letters.”.

Under his pressures, Mr Smith also declared that “”Charlene Violated her Court Order”.

Mr Goodman raised the issue of “Child Trafficking”, and continued on to describe “Foreclosure Fraud”; both issues of which were professed to be ‘of primary concern’ by all of the members of the Colorado Constitutionlists group, including the subversive infiltrators who were sent-in by the prosecution.

Prosecutor Shapiro ‘Objected’ to Mr Goodman attempting to discuss “Foreclosure Fraud” by powerful banking and other financial institutions; and Civil Judge Spear ‘Sustained’ Prosecutor Shapiro’s ‘Objection’ on that point, by declaring only that “Foreclosure Fraud” is “Not Relevant” to This Case.

Mr Goodman tried to introduce case-law related to legitimate accusations of ‘Treason’ to Mr Smith; but Prosecutor Shapiro ‘Objected’ to that, and presiding Judge Spear ‘Sustained’ Prosecutor Shapiro’s ‘Objection’.

On Mr Goodman’s prompt, Mr Smith admitted common people have the Right to make “Citizens Arrests”. Mr Goodman attempted to read the statute authorizing “Citizen’s Arrest” to the Jury, but Mr Goodman was having some difficulties there-with; and so Prosecutor Shapiro Motioned that the entire Court to “Take Judicial Notice” of that Colorado Statute.

Mr Goodman agreed in support of that Motion, and so presiding Judge Spear more quickly and efficiently read the entire statute into the Court’s Record, and for the Jury.

Mr Goodman began reading for the court to hear the case-law of “Chisolm v. Georgia”.

On cross-examination from Mr Goodman, Mr Smith courageously declared that his own or Mr Goodman’s house foreclosure case was treated in Court in manners which were “Un-Fair”; and that the Judge presiding in that case “Ignored the Issues” that Mr Smith then legitimately had raised.

Presiding Civil Judge Spear in this case interjected his dictum that these sorts of issues about how Judges are allegedly acting in un-fair manners related to home foreclosure cases, was “Off Limits” for the Jury to hear, of for his Civil Government Court to even consider.

<Page 22>:

Mr Goodman asked Mr Smith if Mr Smith recognized Mr Goodman’s concern about a “United States Corporation”; but Mr Smith testified that he had no direct knowledge about any such entity.

Prosecutor Shapiro attempted to mitigate the massive power-decentralizing influence of the previously read statute authorizing “Citizen’s Arrest”; by drawing-out the point that such Arrests were only statutorily authorized if and when a Crime was actually Committed “In the Presence” of the Citizen who was considering making the Arrest.

Under immense coercive pressures, Ms Smith went on to testify his present belief, that, as issued by their group of Colorado Constitutionlists; their “Liens were Not Lawful”. Under similar

coercive pressures, Mr Smith continued to testify, that, Bruce “Doucette was Not a Lawful Judge”, and that the “Marshals” that the group had appointed were “Not Lawful”.

As Mr Smith’s testimony as the last witness called continued to wind-down; presiding Civil Judge Spear repeatedly dictated that he would be responsible for deciding “All Issues of Law”, and that Discussions of Law were Prohibited in his Court from manifesting in front of the Jury.

~~~~~  
“Opening Statement”; by the Accused: “Laurence Goodman”:

Mr Goodman asked Judge Spear for additional “Time” to “Prepare” his “Opening Statement”.

Judge Spear “Denied” that request, by saying “No”; and he gave as his reason, because, Mr Goodman had already had two years to prepare such statements.

Mr Goodman courageously pressed on by attempting to reach the “Conscience of the Jury” in this case, by raising the legal concepts of “Fully Informed Juries” and of “Jury Nullification”.

Prosecutor Shapiro promptly ‘Objected’; and Judge Spear Sustained the Prosecutors Objection by dictating that “Law is for Me to Decide”.

Mr Goodman then attempted to focus the Jury’s attention on the epidemic of “Lack of Oath and Bond” amongst the vast majority of People presently Holding ‘Public Offices’ in our State of Colorado; and Mr Goodman went on to read a citation in support there-of, from a U.S. Supreme Court Case.

Mr Goodman nicely drew-out the points that literal multitudes of people holding Public Offices in Colorado are “Not Complying” with their Clear “Constitutional Duties” to provide these “Oath and Bond” documents to Colorado’s Secretary of State; and that they routinely “Refuse to Respond” when confronted about these important constitutional issues, from members of the public, such as the group with whom Mr Goodman was involved in this case.

Mr Goodman emphatically pleaded with the Jury, that, Public “Officials Have to be Held Accountable” for all of these important constitutional issuer, and that, literally, no-one, outside of this specific courageous group of Colorado Constitutionalists, was making any meaningful progress on this important Constitutional and “Public Interest” issue.

Mr Goodman did not use the full 15-minutes that Judge Spear had allocated to Mr Goodman for making his ‘opening statement’.

<Page 23>: Witness 28: By and For the Defense; “Laurence Goodman”.

As with all proceeding witnesses called by the prosecution; Mr Goodman was “Sworn under Law”, (not under ‘penalty of perjury’); and Mr Goodman here-under submitted his testimony in what Judge Spear referred to as “Narrative Fashion”.

Mr Goodman opened his own personal testimony, as “his own witness”, by referencing the case and testimony of another member of the group of Colorado Constitutionalists, one “Paul Adams”, which involved a proceeding in the nature of “Mandamus”.

Mr Adams had been of some stature in the U.S. Military, and Mr Goodman testified how he and Mr Adams had worked for many years on attempting to get public servants to comply with the specific mandates of our State and National Constitutions, which focused on the “Oath of Office” issue.

Prosecutor Shapiro “Objected” to this line of speech, because Shapiro said it was “Hear-say”.

Presiding Judge Spear “Sustained” the Prosecutor’s Objection.

Mr Goodman asked Judge Spear if Goodman could merely “Summarize” Goodman’s experience with Mr Adams.

Judge Spear again said “No”.

Mr Goodman then shifted subjects to criticize Deputy Sheriff Byrne about how Deputy Byrne

had been obstructing the Right of Colorado's People to fundamental Habeas-Corpus process.

Mr Goodman then switched subjects to informing all members of the court, for a second time, and especially to Judge Spear, that, "The Defendant has been Surrendered in this case".

While these words might be incomprehensible to people not familiar with this phraseology; this author knows that the word "Defendant" as here-in referenced by Mr Goodman, is Goodman's reference to the "ALL CAPS NAME" which appears on the vast majority of the paper-work from the Prosecution in this case, as "LAURENCE GOODMAN".

It is the firm belief of many reputable non-bar constitutional-law scholars, that these instances of civil government agents referencing any person's name in "ALL CAPS LETTERS", is how they refer to a "Fictional Entity", or "Legal Fiction", or "Straw-Man", or "Privy Token", which has been Created by Government agents, similarly as they Create a "Corporate Franchise". Our best scholarship indicates, that, this Created "Legal Fiction Entity" has absolutely Nothing to do with the Living and Breathing Natural/Organic Flesh and Blood "Man", whom Constitutionalists describe in differing manners, but all-ways Avoiding the use of "All Capitol Letters"; and which in this instance, Mr Goodman has personally chosen to describe for him-self, as: "Laurence-rene': Goodman".

So; when Mr Goodman informed court, and Judge Spear, that, "The Defendant has been Surrendered in this case"; Mr Goodman was informing those Court Officers that the Legal Fiction which they have created and have been prosecuting, on paper; has had paper documents "Surrendered to the Court, which have that same "ALL CAPS NAME" of "LAURANCE GOODMAN"; that, Documents also containing that 'legal-fiction corporate franchise name', are what have actually been "Surrendered to the Court".

While there are differing views of the effectiveness of pursuing this specific strategy in our larger movement of American Constitutionalists; this author knows that Mr Goodman and his supporters in this specific strategy, all believe that making these sorts of arguments will cause the Courts of the Civil Government of this State to "Loose their Jurisdiction" over all non-violent criminal-prosecutions; as is the case in this prosecution of Laurence Goodman".

And that is Why Mr Goodman here repeated his other-wise confusing statement, that, "The Defendant has been Surrendered in this case".

Presiding Civil Government Judge Spear Refused to Recognize any merit to that argument presented from and by Mr Goodman.

Mr Goodman then switched subjects to discussing "CUSIP Numbers". The ambiguous acronym there stands for: "Committee on Uniform Securities Identification Procedures"; where-in specific numbers are imprinted on secured commercial documents in order to track and identify them with more efficiency. ... <https://www.investopedia.com/ask/answers/what-is-a-cusip-number/>

Mr Goodman here presented serious argument, that, the fact that this case prosecuting him, (as with many other victims of what might be referred to as "Political Crime Prosecutions", including the prosecutions of all other members of this group of Colorado Constitutionalists); all of these prosecutions have had these "CUSIP Numbers" attached to the paperwork which is prosecuting them, either by Prosecutors or by Court Officials, all solidly and routinely entangled with the prosecution of these sorts of 'victimless', 'no corpus-delecti', and 'non due-process' and "Crimes".

Prosecutors and Court Officials are quite well aware of these "CUSIP Numbers" appearing prominently in these sorts of Court related documents; and Mr Goodman here made the bold proposition, that this economic "Securities Tracking" process being attached to these sorts of Un-Constitutional Criminal-Prosecutions, is Evidence that these Prosecutors and/or Court-Officials are actually engaged in "Human Trafficking", or "Slave Trading".

Mr Goodman here only used the specific phrase "Human Trafficking"; but there was a

painfully long and pregnant “Silence” following Mr Goodman’s raising of this potentially explosive issue. Presiding Judge Spear finally broke that long Silence by only saying to Mr Goodman: “Anything Else?”.

Mr Goodman here switched subjects, to pointing out the common-knowledge fact, that, there are “Problems with the Judicial System” as presently run by the Civil Governments of our State and Nation, and more specifically in “Rio Grande County”.

Mr Goodman again switched subjects to pointedly focus on the well-documented fact, that, “All of the Officials had Plenty of Opportunity to Respond”, and there-by to deescalate this ideological, political, and commercial conflict. Mr Goodman solemnly affirmed, that, if any of them had Responded by saying any-thing like “Lets Work This Out”; then that likely would have “Solved the Whole Problem”, and that none of the Public Office holders who have postured as “Victims” here-in would have ever there-under been targeted for the intense escalation of tone in the paper-work that was sent out.

Mr Goodman then went on to explain how the high dollar value on the Liens was “Justified”. In support of this argument; Mr Goodman cited a Florida case where a man was falsely imprisoned for about 25-minutes, and he was there-under awarded damages judgement of somewhere I recall between \$20,000.00 and \$50,000.00. There-under; when Corrupted Public-Servants Falsely-Imprison People, when they have No Constitutional “Probable Cause” to Believe any legitimate “Crime” was actually Committed; and such False-Imprisonment results in “Jail-Time of Years”; then, here-under, these Large Dollar Values on such Liens as were issued by this group of Colorado Constitutionalists, was “Justified”.

Mr Goodman here argued that the nature of the Limited Jurisdiction of this District Court as provided by the Civil Government of our State of Colorado, causes this Court to “Not have” sufficient “Jurisdiction” to adjudicate the legitimacy of the “Commercial Liens” which have been used by this group of Colorado Constitutionalists.

Mr Goodman then changed subjects to describe legitimate Reasons Why, a specific Historical Document. That document sheds important light on the Defense issue which relates to the Failure of multitudes of modern Colorado Public Servants to Comply with their Constitutional Duties to properly file with the Secretary of State, or the County Clerk, their properly signed and bonded “Oath of Office” documents.

Admission of this document into the Court’s Record would have allowed Jurors to see the “Constitutional Basis” and therefore the “Justification” for the vast majority of the activities of Mr Goodman and his fellow Colorado Constitutionalists.

Presiding State-Civil-Government District Judge Spear Refused to allow that Constitutional Historical Document to even be considered by the Jury, or to be entered into the Court’s Record.

<Page 24>:

Mr Goodman’s Testimony, continued: as he continued on again with his attempts to draw into question the legitimacy of the “Jurisdiction of the Court”, here by mounting another argument similar to that preciously described about the “CUSIP Numbers”, only this time drawing attention to the fact that the Denver District Court, the Denver District Attorney’s Office, and the Colorado attorney General’s Office, and the Colorado Supreme Court, all have attached to their Offices, “Dun & Bradstreet Numbers”.

This fact that these Public Offices have entangled themselves with these “Dun & Bradstreet Numbers”, tends to Evidence that each such Public Office is Compromized in its Constitutional Duty to Serve the People of Colorado or Denver County; and they rather are more concerned about Making

Private Profits, so that their Credit Ratings under their Private “Dun & Bradstreet Numbers” will continue to make money for them for a long time into the future.

This author is inclined to believe this is the full explanation of Why Mr Goodman was here referencing these “Dun & Bradstreet Numbers” being entangled with these Public Offices.

Prosecutor Shapiro promptly “Objected” to Mr Goodman discussing these “Dun & Bradstreet Numbers”, on the grounds that this information was allegedly “Hear-say”, because it was obtained off of the Internet. Although my notes failed to describe presiding Judge Spears ruling on Prosecutor Shapiro’s ‘Objection’ here, I am inclined to believe that Objection was ‘Sustained’ by Judge Spear.

Mr Goodman then switched subjects to attempting to enter into the Court’s Record, Evidence of the “Eleven U.S. Code Citations” which Law Scholar “Hartford Van Dyke” prioritizes as those which most powerfully support the Rights of common People to hold Accused Corrupted Government Office holders to some form of Accountability.

Presiding Municipal Government Judge Spear “Denied” Mr Goodman’s request to have these “Eleven U.S. Code Citations” placed into the Court’s Record, and there-by made available to the Jury.

In his response there-to, presiding Judge Spear clearly declared, that: “We are Not Here to engage the Jury in a Law-School Education Program. We do not have the time.”.

Mr Goodman here concluded his personal testimony.

Prosecutor Robert Shapiro then took his turn to Cross-Examine Mr Goodman. Prosecutor Shapiro here opened by asking Mr Goodman if he was born in the USA; and Mr Goodman answered “Yes” to that question.

Prosecutor Shapiro then went on to ask Mr Goodman, if a clear need arose for him, if Mr Goodman expected to be able to call and receive help from either the County Fire Department or the County Sheriff’s Department.

This authors notes indicate that Mr Goodman did not clearly answer that question.

Prosecutor Shapiro then went on to ask Mr Goodman if he and other members of the group of Colorado Constitutionlists had been Warned and directed by NLA guru “John Darash”, that “Liens are Not to be Used by the group”.

Prosecutor Shapiro also here asked if these Liens or other documents had been used by the group “as a Tool to Get Back at Public Officials”, Privately, (as opposed to the group’s general contentions that they were using that paper-work in the “Public Interests of Justice”).

Prosecutor Shapiro continued on by asking Mr Goodman if he recalled that the general Constitutionlist “Sheriff Mack” had clearly declared to the group that “Common-Law Grand-Juries” are “Kooky”.

This author’s notes do not indicate that any clear answers to these last three questions were given by Mr Goodman.

Mr Goodman here ded declare that he is generally “Not very Comfortable in Public”; and this author seems to recall also that Mr Goodman here did declare that he was more comfortable writing documents in his efforts to seek Accountability from all of the Public Office holders whom him and so many others have so publicly accused of criminally subversive activities.

Prosecutor Shapiro then asked Mr Goodman if Esther Williams had assisted Mr Goodman in composing the Documents that Mr Goodman had so publicly distributed composed to so many holders of Public Offices. Prosecutor Shapiro here also focused on whether or not Michael Williams had also Assisted Mr Goodman in any of his Colorado Constitutionlists group activities.

<Page 25>

As Prosecutor Shapiro continued cross-examining Mr Goodman, Mr Goodman went on to

declare, that, the group's use of "Liens were intended to prompt Communications from Public Officials", (as opposed to the Private Agenda of 'Personal Revenge or Retribution', which the entire Prosecution's Team had consistently been alleging).

Deputy Byrne again here some-how influenced this part of the discussion, by suggesting to Mr Goodman, that, their group of Colorado Constitutionals had effectively declared that it was "Open Season on Treason". Mr Goodman voiced agreement with that proposition, as it was technically worded, (but which was not the negative and imaginary "Treason" that Deputy Byrne was likely here seeking to imply).

Prosecutor Shapiro here shifted his focus to asking Mr Goodman if the Court action which issued a judgement in which the group's Liens were colorably declared to be "Spurious", was a legitimate response by the presiding Judge of that Court to the Liens and other documents of the group.

Mr Goodman here firmly and courageously declared, that, the presiding Judge's declaration there-in, was "Not a Reasonable Response".

Prosecutor Shapiro followed by asking Mr Goodman, if Mr Goodman knew that the man who had helped to provide the templates and wording of many of the group's Liens, one "Hartford Van Dyke"; if Mr Goodman know that "Hartford had been Convicted of a Felony". Mr Goodman answered "Yes" to that question.

(This author has since been on the phone with Mr Van Dyke; and Mr Van Dyke assured me that Court proceeding did Not follow Constitutional "Due Process of Law", and there-under, the "Conviction" colorably obtained was "Void"; and further there-under, and as a "Matter of Law", Mr Van Dyke was there-in "Not Convicted" of any "Felony". During that trial, Federal "Judge Robert Jones", presided; and the Charge against Mr Van Dyke was "Manufacture & Distribution of Fictitious Instruments". There-under; at least one "Motion in Limine" was then in place, all of which is fundamentally Repugnant to our American Constitutional Concept of "Due Process of Law". Mr Van Dyke has here-under informed this author, that, he was not given any reasonable chance to make legitimate arguments in his own defense. This author is strongly inclined to agree with Mr Van Dyke's conclusions here, about whether or not he was actually and legitimately "Convicted of a Felony"; and that Mr Goodman's words here, in response to Prosecutor's Shapiro's leading question, is "In Error".)

Prosecutor Shapiro here next asked Mr Goodman if he has spoken the words about an accused corrupted public servant to "Haul her ass Down there".

Mr Goodman effectively admitted that he did speak those words; however he quickly added, that, all of those words were all spoken primarily in efforts to "get communications from her", (and likely to get some form of actual accountability for her actions).

On Prosecutor Shapiro's continuing cross-examination; Mr Goodman clarified points concerning his litigation involving the Federal IRS, by firmly declaring that IRS Complaints and prosecution against him was all solidly rooted in "Fraud" by those supposed Public-Servants.

Mr Goodman here went on even further to describe how these powerful Federal Officers had actually influenced the local County Sheriff to "Lie" to Mr Goodman, in that Sheriff's actual physical assistance in helping those Constitutionally Lawless IRS Agents to Lawlessly and Criminally "Steal" Mr Goodman's Home.

Mr Goodman continued on to explain how multitudes of similar Criminal Actions from IRS Agents have resulted in the "Common-Place" Theft of Homes, not only of Colorado Constitutionalist's group members, but also from many non-group members in Colorado, and all across the USA.

<Page 26>: 2019-January-17, Thursday:

The Prosecution team opened this days discussions by motioning to Modify the “Jury Instructions” that then had been composed in documents before the Court. The Prosecution here moved the Court to modify the Definitions of the word “Threat, and also the phrase “True Threat”; as those two terms were used in the Indictment document to describe the actions against holders of Public Offices, by the accused group members, including the Defendant here-in, Mr Goodman.

Those modifications were approved by presiding Judge Spear without much controversy.

Presiding Judge Spear again here, as with numerous times through-out this trial, did again voice his concerns to Constrain in-depth Pursuit of the sacred cause of “Justice”, because of his constant and over-riding prioritized concern about the artificial “Time” limitations, which he had previously placed on this entire trial. Judge Shapiro’s concerns here did clearly effect the entire agenda of the entire Court, including the Jury, all in such manners as caused a “Rush to Judgement”; all of which is “Reversible Error”; and which, “as a matter of law”, renders any negative Judgement here-by obtained against Mr Goodman, to be “Null and Void”.

Mr Goodman here again, as in other instances, voiced his Objection to the Jurisdiction of the Court, based on Mr Goodman’s accusation that this Colorado District Court was Not an “Article Three Court”, as generally described in “Article Three” of the “Federal Constitution”.

Mr Goodman again declared for the Court’s Record, that Mr Goodman was here only under “Special Appearance”, which is exclusively focused to “Challenge Jurisdiction”; and additionally, Mr Goodman here again declared that he was again “Reserving All Rights”.

As in other instances, Presiding Judge Spear here again made multiple references to Legalistic “Terms of Art”.

Mr Goodman here submitted his powerful “Accountability Argument”, to the effect, that, “When ‘Public Officials’ do Not have” their Constitutionally Required “Oaths and Bonds” in place; that, there-under, they are Not Legitimately Recognizable as true “Public Servants”; and that with his clear implication, that, those “Public Servants” do there-under Not Deserve such Protections as are being mounted in their favor through this case, by those occupying the Office of the Public Prosecutor.

Prosecutor Shapiro here revisited the documented “Jury Instructions”; and there-under, he asked for clarification or modification of the word contained there-in, of “Conspiracy”. Prosecutor Shapiro here declared that his intent through focusing on clarifying the definition of this important word, was that of “Assisting the Jury, so that they are Not Confused”.

Mr Goodman attempted to follow this line of conversation, by asking presiding Judge Spear for permission to also Include in the ‘Jury Instructions’, a clear Definition of the word “Treason”; and Mr Goodman promptly offered case-law which does contain there-in definitions of that important word “Treason”.

Prosecutor Shapiro “Objected” to this definition being included in the ‘Jury Instructions’; because, he alleged, there were “No Charges of Treason” in any of the Complaints then before the Court. Presiding Judge Spear “Sustained” both Prosecutor Shapiro’s ‘Objection’ here; and also his reasoning.

<Page 27>:

Mr Goodman here continued on by attempting to convince presiding Judge Spear that the interests of Justice in this proceeding required that the Jury be informed of the “Two Types of Citizenship” that he and many other Constitutionlists believe are modernly but secretive “in play” in court proceedings such as these, those two being that of fashionable but secretly dis-empowered “U.S. Citizens”, and also the fully sovereign “American Nationals”.

Prosecutor Shapiro promptly 'Objected' to this line of discussion, allegedly because it involved a "Legal Argument", and there-on, because all such arguments may only be articulated in this 'municipally franchised tribunal', allegedly, by presiding Judge Spear.

Judge Spear promptly 'Sustained' prosecutor Shapiro's 'Objection' here.

Again here, as many times in this trial previously; presiding Judge Spear voiced emphatic concerns about "Time"; all of which were clearly over-riding many opportunities for Mr Goodman to have a greater say in these proceedings. This author then noted clearly how my own research on the Greco/Roman God "Chronos", who seems to share a similar "Ideology" as prosecutor Shapiro and Judge Spear, in that Chronos, according to the legend, was the "God of Time". Prosecutor Shapiro and Judge Spear here are both clearly disregarding the "Fundamental Principle of Fairness", as embodied with Colorado's Constitutional Mandate for "Open Courts", "Public Courts", and "Due Process of Law"; all in their big panic effort to constrain Chronos-God based "Time", to the specific limitations of their un-reasonably pre-determined Schedule. In the well-studied mind of this author; this is all clearly a "Rush to Judgement"; all of which, in turn, and as a "matter of law", causes any negative Judgement achieved here-under against Mr Goodman, to be "Null and Void". The legends related to Chronos, indicate that he was related to the god "Saturn", which in turn is related to the evil god "Satan". And the "Time" Constraints imposed here, by Judge Spear and Prosecutor Shapiro, indicate to this author, that they both share the same "Ideology" as that evil god.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chronos>

<http://www.myastrologybook.com/Saturn-Kronos-Chronos-mythology-god.htm>

Prosecutor Shapiro here presented documents which seemed to indicate, that, the IRS had billed Mr Goodman for only \$460,000.00 or so; and there-under, that, Mr Goodman had spoken 'Falsely'; when Mr Goodman had declared that the IRS had billed Mr Goodman for "Ten Million Dollars". Mr Goodman then presented arguments which tended to indicate that the higher-numbers from his own testimony, were the more accurate numbers; but, those arguments did not make it in-to this author's notes.

Judge Spear again spoke concerns about the possibility that "Brian Loma" might re-appear in these court proceedings; and that he might actually dare to "Record" these supposedly "Open and Public Court" proceedings.

Judge Spear then "Apologized" to the Jury, for making them wait, and for wasting their "Time".

Prosecutor Shapiro again called as a Witness, FBI Agent "Ryan English"

Agent English here testified, that, Mr Goodman was "Wrong" in claiming that the IRS had billed Mr Goodman for "Ten Million Dollars". Mr English had obtained documents from his "Federal Jurisdiction", which indicated that the true bill to Mr Goodman then was only about \$462,000.00.

<Page 28>

Mr Goodman responded to Agent English's previous accusation, by asking Agent English if he was a bar-member "Attorney"; and if he could produce a "Bar Card". But more than that; Mr Goodman followed-up nicely by asking Agent English if there was a Constitutionally Guaranteed "Trial by Jury" before the IRS and local Sheriffs Deputies Forcibly Seized Mr Goodman's home. Mr English meekly admitted that there was "No Jury Trail" before those supposed "Public Servants forcibly Seized Mr Goodman's home; and that instead, all of that was concluded under the quasi-military court procedure which is known as "Summary Judgement".

Then was "Concluded", all Testimony from Witnesses, for this trail.

Presiding Judge Spear then spoke directly to the Jury, by informing them of the robotic and cold-hearted nature of the municipal jurisdiction “Court” that he was presiding over; by declaring to them, that, “”Law Demands that I Read these ‘Jury Instructions’ to you”. Judge Spear followed that promptly by further declaring that the Jury “Must Apply the Rules as Read to you”; and that the Jury should coldly “Not Consider what the eventual Punishment might be” for Mr Goodman.,

Presiding Judge Spear went on to read lengthy ‘Jury Instructions’ to the Jury; most of which seemed to this author, to be a big “Waste of Time”; mostly because Judge Spear was there-in reading verbatim many Statutes, each of which contained “Statutory Language”, the vast majority of which was neither directly related nor directly relevant to this case.

Presiding Judge Spear then did focus nicely for a few moments on obtaining an accurate definition for the word “Threat”; but many other “Definitions of Words” were also then lengthily read by him to the Jury; all of which, (again, in this author’s opinion), was another big “Waste of Time”.

<Page 29> “Closing Statements” began here.

Prosecutor Shapiro here began his closing-statement, by inflammatorily quoting Mr Goodman’s ‘poorly-chosen words’, of: “Haul Her Ass Down There”.

Prosecutor Shapiro then quickly moved on to discussing the case that dramatically escalated this ideological battle, which involved the Loss of the Home of one “Charlene Von Schlesien”, through a summary and quasi-military “Foreclosure”; and which similarly involved Ms Von Schlesien’s summary Imprisonment, after motions falsely posturing as a Lawful “Trial” had been completed.

Prosecutor Shapiro stood before the Jury here, and boldly declared, with a straight face, that, these supposed “Public Servants”, were “Simply Doing Their Job”.

Prosecutor Shapiro here did seem to nicely admit, that, “Freeing America from British Tyranny” was a “Good Thing”; but these same notes indicate that he then also accused this Defendant Goodman and his previous associates of indulging in the newly invented category of Crimes which salivating military-police-state advocates refer to as “Paper Terrorism”.

Prosecutor Shapiro here pleaded at length for the Jury to recognize that all of these Powerful “Public Servants” were allegedly criminally abused by these named Defendants, simply through the large volume of seriously confrontational paper-work that had been sent to them.

Prosecutor Shapiro here completely aborted all larger contextual reference to Constitutionally Guaranteed “Rules of the Common-Law” and “Due Process of Law”; by proposing, that, the related concept of the “Rule of Law” Demanded that these Accused “Criminally Corrupted Public-Servants” be Protected; and that with-out ever adjudicating whether or not there was actually any “Basis in Law” for those “Criminal Accusations” against those supposed “Public Servants”.

Here-under, and on numerous occasions; Prosecutor Shapiro pointed directly at Mr Goodman, and Pleaded for the Jury to recognize, that, Mr Goodman was “The Engine that Made This Thing Go”.

Prosecutor Shapiro did here also briefly give his explanation on the concern of these Constitutionlists about their carrying “Bonds” to protect the Public from possible “Abuse of Public Office”. Prosecutor Shapiro here confidently declared, that, the “Legislature ‘Changed the Law’ about Public Office holders Needing ‘Bonds’”.

Prosecutor Shapiro here also clearly attempted to imply that Mr Goodman was suffering from some sort of Illness in his “Mental State”.

Mr Goodman here began his closing-statement, by focusing more wholistically, through his words, that, “the Group, ‘We the People’, should be considered as ‘Whistle-blowers’, upholding the Constitution”.

Mr Goodman here focused sharply, on the fact, that this Colorado Constitutionalist's group had Followed Publicly Available 'Administrative Process', to secure an "Administrative Judgement", through 'Default', and 'Failure to Respond' by the accused corrupted "Public Servants". This is the Reason which Mr Goodman gave for "Why" it was 'Lawful' for the Colorado Constitutionalist's group to follow-up with seriously confrontational letters and commercial 'Liens' against these 'Administratively Defaulting Public-Servants'.

Prosecutor Shapiro here promptly 'Objected' to Mr Goodman explaining all of this 'Justification', for him and the other group members acting in this seriously confrontational manner; and presiding Judge Spear promptly 'Sustained' that Objection.

Mr Goodman then went on to read his frequently included "Peace Notice" from one of his documents; where-in he nicely explained that every-thing that he and the other group members had done, was done in their own thoughtfully-considered Efforts at Achieving 'Peace' with these suspected and formally accused Corrupted "Public Servants".

Mr Goodman here referenced also to "Our President Trump"; whom Mr Goodman here claimed was, similarly as himself and many others, claiming the distinct Status of an "American National".

Mr Goodman here went on too point out that the entire case of the Prosecution Contained "No Sworn Affidavits" from any supposed "Public Servants", to the effect that any actual Crimes had been committed against any of them by any members of the Colorado Constitutionalist's group.

Mr Goodman continued on by courageously pointing-out that both Colorado and US-Code Statutes Mandate a Duty of All People to "Report Crimes"; and that, in effect, this was the honest summary of the full "Intent" of what he and his fellow group members were attempting to accomplish.

Mr Goodman again challenged the Jurisdiction of this municipally franchised Court, by declaring that he is "Not the Defendant" who is named in 'ALL CAPITOL LETTERS' in the Indictment document; but rather that entity is actually a 'Legal Fiction' entity, which Mr Goodman and reputable others have concluded lawfully amounts to a "Cestui Que Trust".

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cestui_que

<Page 30>:

Mr Goodman continued to build on his previous statement, by declaring, in light of all documents then filed in this case; that, Trust Law mandates, that, effectively, Judge Spear is Now the "Trustee in This Case".

Mr Goodman went on to declare, that, during the time-period that lead up to his case with the Federal "IRS", that, Mr Goodman had "No Taxable Income".

In closing here, Mr Goodman also courageously declared, that, "the Supreme Law of the Land is Perverted through Private Statutes and Codes"; and that a dark cabal of evil people who posture as legitimate 'Public Servants', are "Altering the Form and Administration of Government"; all of which is a very serious criminal accusation, which still has not yet been lawfully addressed.

Mr Goodman went on to declare, that, basic and anciently rooted "Commercial Law, is, Common Sense"; and he further declared, that, "Unauthorized Exercise of Law will Destroy Civilization"; and that all of these activities, by himself and others, were only an "Endeavor to Correct Problems going on in the State of Colorado".

Prosecutor Shapiro was then authorized by Judge Spear to mount some sort of a final "Rebuttal" to the Defenses that Mr Goodman had raised. Prosecutor Shapiro then directly launched into his Accusation that Mr Goodman was in Violation of the "Rule of Law", and that Mr Goodman "Wanted to Do What-Ever He Wanted", with no meaningful accountability to our larger society for Mr Goodman's actions, allegedly.

Prosecutor Shapiro went on to declare that the case of “Charlene Von Schlesien” was only exacerbated because of “Problems Of Her Own Making”; and Prosecutor Shapiro took that statement and boldly applied it to every member of this group of Colorado Constitutionlists, including Mr Goodman.

Prosecutor Shapiro held up as ‘More Responsible Dissidents’ of similar ‘Constitutionalist’ Ideology, the two previously referenced activists, named as: “John Darash”, and as: “Sheriff Richard Mack”. Prosecutor Shapiro boldly implied that these two activists were ‘more responsible’ than Mr Goodman and the other members of the Colorado Group; because, those two activists had chosen less confrontational pathways, and had spoken against the use of both “Liens”, and “Grand Juries”.

Prosecutor Shapiro concluded by declaring, that, “That is Not how we Solve Problems in America”; and he went on to declare, that, “We Discuss and Debate”.

Prosecutor Shapiro here referenced “Our Law”, seeming implying that the quagmire of confusing “Rules of Court”, all under their Roman Empire Municipal Model of Administering Justice; was Not the Source of the very “Chaos”, which he then so boldly and directly accused Mr Goodman of actually causing.

Prosecutor Shapiro closed by asking the Jury to “Show How Representative Democracy Functions under ‘Rule of Law’.”.

<Page 31>: Presiding Judge Spear here legitimately affirmed to the Jury, that, a “Unanimous Verdict is Required”; and directed the jury to their “Sequestered Room”.

2019-January-17; Friday:

Juror Deliberations continued from yesterday afternoon; and, at one point, the Jurors asked Judge Spear what to do, if they are Not able to Agree on one of the counts in the indictment/complaint.

Mr Goodman again declared that he was only appearing in this municipally franchised nis-prius Court through “Special Appearance”, and that he was “Reserving his Rights”.

<https://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/nisi>

Presiding Judge Spear said that this Jury was taking more time than did the Juries who decided the cases of Doucette, Nulty, and Bifield.

When the Jury was again present in the full Court-room, Judge Spear affirmed to them, that, “You are Judges, Judges of the Facts”.

The Jury announced that they had achieved their “Unanimous Verdict”, near 2-pm, on Friday. Presiding Judge Spear began reading the Verdict document, “count by count”; and declaring that the Jury had decided that Mr Goodman was “Guilty”, as he read each of the 25 counts. Judge Spear then “Polled Each Juror”, verbally, in efforts to affirm that each of the Jurors had voluntarily come to Agree that Mr Goodman was actually “Guilty” on each of these 25 counts. Each Juror did so affirm.

Judge Spear then went on to declare, that, “All Restrictions are Lifted” from his control over the Jury, there-by authorizing the Jurors and the Public to talk about the case, and the verdict, freely with concerned others, at least so long as all parties felt comfortable sharing in such discussions.

Presiding Judge Spear announced that “Sentencing” would be scheduled to occur in this case, on the date of “March 20th, 2019; and that there would be “No Bond Allowed” where-under Mr Goodman could obtain some form of conditional release from his present imprisonment.

~~~~~

This document is not represented by this author as being precisely accurate; as it is here-in hurriedly typed, from hurriedly-composed notes. This document is composed by this author as a “Public Service”, and in the “Interests of Public Justice”; and out of “Necessity”. This legal positioning and wording is here-in declared, mostly because, the District Court System being run by the Officers of the Civil/Municipal Government of the State of Colorado, do seem to be routinely “Obstructing Justice”, by the manner in which they routinely Refuse to allow Reasonable “Recordings” to be taken of Court Proceedings, by Legitimately Concerned and Good-Standing “Members of the Public”, in our Organic Constitutional Body-Politic “State of Colorado”.

I plan on posting this document on a web-page, and on distributing it widely, to all concerned parties, including to both Prosecutor Shapiro and to Judge Spear.

All of these parties are humbly requested by me to “Point Out Any Errors” that any among you might find in this document.

If and when it seems to me, that, any such ‘Allegations of Error’ here-in, are “Reasonable”; then I promise to promptly “Up-Date and Change” this Version of this Transcript; and I will promptly submit my-self to any conscience-bound and non-coerced “Jury”, if and when any accusations against me, what-so-ever, might escalate.

These words are True.

“God’s Will be Done;  
on this Earth, as in the Heavens.”

---

“Charles Bruce”, of the Clan “Stewart”.  
General Delivery; in Lafayette Colorado. [80026-9999]  
charles@constitutionalgov.us  
720-583-1684; Land-Line.