Marcus Loring: de la Houssaye

910 North Wilderness Trail

Carencro[70520]Louisiana

337 298 2630

St Martin Parish Sheriff Ronald J. Theriot

400 Saint Martin Street

Saint Martinville, LA 70582

NOTICE OF REJECTION OF CONTRACTUAL OFFER

NOTICE OF CRIMINAL COMPLAINT

NOTICE OF NULLIFICATION OF ORDER BY LAW,

IN THE INTERESTS OF JUSTICE.

NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL, NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS

NOTICE TO AGENT. ANY PART WISHING TO DISPUTE THE CLAIMS MADE HEREIN

MUST DO SO IN WRITING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF RECEIPT AND MUST ANSWER

UNDER OATH AND PENALTY OF PERJURY BEFORE A NTOARY PUBLIC.

Regarding Case # 12-243633, 12-243632, 12-243634

I am writing to you in your capacity as CEO of the courts in the parish, to undo a most

egregious violation of law and individual rights committed by a court in THIS, St Martin Parish, under your jurisdiction (oath to speak).

In your duties of responsibility for the care and custody of individuals pending court action,

NO SUCH DISCRETION was exercised over the case brought against me, and by definition of your duty you have a responsibility to ensure there is a valid cause of action against an individual being brought into court.

At 4:30 PM Tuesday 02-06-2013 a transaction of a security interest was attempted to be

forced upon me without consent by an imposter body purporting to be a court of law. It was

made clear with respect to that transaction that I, Marcus Loring; de la Houssaye, did NOT consent to stand under the cause and nature of the charges and proceedings against me because this was an alien and wholly foreign process as they refused to observe due process of law.

This alleged "court" FAILED to so duly inform me of the CAUSE and NATURE of the charges AND proceedings against me.

As I understand it, the DUTY I have to claim is a RIGHT to be INFORMED of the CAUSE and NATURE of the charges AND proceedings against me, yet this court refused to offer discussion or discovery so as I could enter an informed plea, and I DID NOT enter a plea at that or any other time. It was premature to enter a plea and a violation of due process of law to demand a plea be entered BEFORE discussion.

As we all know, discussion comes first in lawful order of due process of law. In violation of all due process of law the judge took the defendant's stand and HE agreed to stand under the cause and nature of the charges and proceedings.

I appeared Sui Juris, by special appearance only, at arraignment.

I am revoking this contract on the grounds that I did not KNOWINGLY, WILLFULLY or

INTENTIONALLY of my own VOLUNTARY consent, enter into this agreement, but did so

under intimidation, coercion, threat of force, and extreme duress.

The charges against me contained NO actual element of harm, they did not establish corpus delicti, they did not prove standing, and there was not a SINGLE ELEMENT of a VALID CAUSE OF ACTION to this alleged charge.

There were attempts to intimidate me in the free exercise and enjoyment of unalienable rights in

violation of Title18 U.S.C 242 under color of law, and there IS EVIDENCE OF a conspiracy against my rights in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. 241 committed by Judge Anne Lennan Simon, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries agent James "Dusty" Rhodes, and Assistant District Attorney Nick Markowitz under DISTRICT ATTORNEY Phil Haney, to deprive me of my right to a trial by a jury of my peers.

NUMEROUS rights were violated in addition to obstruction of justice and interference in my DUTY to claim and exercise the right to DUE PROCESS OF LAW, to BE INFORMED OF THE CAUSE AND NATURE OF THE CHARGES AND PROCEEDINGS AGAINST ME, and in addition to all this, my RIGHT TO A TRIAL BY A JURY OF MY PEERS, was ALSO violated. The District Attorney specifically violated my right to a trial by jury stating that I do not possess the right to a trial by a jury.

It is YOUR DUTY Sheriff Theriot to ENSURE the PEACE and that the rights of the people are not violated. YOU should have prevented this matter from having gone to trial in the first place for lack of cause. And this was NOT a trial. It was a kangaroo court, a drumhead trial with a PREDETERMINED VERDICT and the arraignment hearing was not even a meaningful hearing.

At the arraignment, I was forced to sign and agree to the contract under threat of unlawful imprisonment if I did not sign it, and I was coerced with threats by 2 large men carrying guns, and mind you, I HAVE COMMITTED NO CRIME. Let's remember, I am presumed innocent UNTIL PROVEN guilty.

ANY and ALL signatures of presumed consent were given under protest and duress. The initial charge itself is ridiculous, as I have not adopted any rules and regulations of wild birds nor do I possess any wild birds, nor is there any evidence that I have adopted any wild birds.

There is no evidence of any kind to even substantiate the charge, there are only threats and intimidation and violations of rights and due process of law by the judge and Assistant District Attorney.

In spite of my attempt to offer discussion (in common law) to avoid conflict in this matter, having answered the summons honorably in writing by certified mail proven by tracking

ID#7012 0470 0000 1488 7269 delivered 09/20/2012 demanding a response in the same way demanded of me, the agents of the corporate empire that issued me the summons, THEMSELVES fell into DEFAULT in this matter by failing to answer MY answer.

There was never a valid response to my answer to the summons, and as such, summary judgment in my favor should have been granted in this matter, but instead the judge decided to take on an authority never granted by anyone, and the Assistant District Attorney as prosecutor did conspire with that judge to deprive me of my right to a jury trial under color of law.

There has not been any discussion or discovery to this date offered in this matter. While under special appearance at arraignment it was made clear that there was NOT a real party of interest nor any VALID claim of loss or harm against me, and as such I concluded my special appearance at that time and the charges should have been dismissed for failure to prosecute.

Instead of exercising the judicial DUTY to dismiss, the judge entered unlawfully I might add, a plea on my behalf without my consent as I appeared Sui Juris and I am more than capable of speaking and administrating my own affairs at law.

This judge does NOT REPRESENT ME, and had no authority to AGAIN VIOLATE DUE PROCESS OF LAW and refuse to allow discussion to take place even though evidence was submitted that discussion had been offered by ME and refused by the ticketing corporation.

I have NOT been accused of ANY crime which is clear as there is no complaining party.

This was JUST a transaction of a security interest which I refused to consent to. SO, this could

ONLY be a transaction related to a contract, which is WHY my ANSWER TO THE SUMMONS asked for an original bill and a copy of the contract, because I understand I am not being charged with a crime so I can only be getting sued by a corporation for violating a contractual term, but there is NO EVIDENCE that I am IN CONTRACT.

This notice shall serve as evidence that I am revoking any implied or presumed consent to any contract with the court regarding this to pay monies, to serve time, and to be otherwise restricted and restrained in my freedom under color of law when I have not committed a crime, nor have I been observed breeching the peace.

I am making it clear and in no uncertain terms that regarding the mentioned case,

I DO NOT CONSENT to the terms offered by this alleged court.

I DEMAND my right to a TRIAL BY A JURY OF MY PEERS in this matter,

and I hereby NULLIFY and serve notice of that nullification,

of this LAWLESS most criminal violation of individual rights which constitutes:

1. Gross negligence equal to fraud.

2. ACTUAL fraud as well as constructive fraud in lies of omission.

3. Dereliction of Duty.

4. Violation of oath of office.

5. Malfeasance.

6. Misfeasance.

7. Obstruction of Justice (interfering in my lawful duty to claim and exercise rights)

8. Intimidation in the free exercise and enjoyment of rights or

for having so exercised the same under color of law.

9. Conspiracy against rights.(District attorney Nick Markowitz and Judge Anne Lennan Simon,

conspired to deprive me of my right to due process of law

as well as my right to a trial by jury).

10. Oppression .

11. General corruption.

12. Judicial tyranny and cowardice.

13. Extortion.

14. Racketeering.

As CEO of ALL of the courts within the parish and the oldest office under the system of

common law as well as the HIGHEST office of constitutional law in the land, EQUAL to the

president and not subordinate TO the president, but subordinate TO the rights of the free people.

Your office is now served NOTICE of this criminal complaint and revocation of an attempt to

defraud me, committed by a body allegedly and purporting to be a court and an individual

purporting to be a judge as well as an individual purporting to be an Assistant District Attorney. They are all imposters because the LAWFUL scope of the power of these agents of the state END at the border of their criminal activity.

NO CRIME has been alleged against me.

BUT it IS a crime which has been committed against me.

The valid things we will place people in cages for today, I would think are: ACTUAL injury or damage to person or property or ACTUAL fraud or violation of lawful rights and should be the ONLY valid reasons someone should fear a cage.

And lawfully speaking that is true, unless one voluntarily agrees to go to jail in a contract with one of these "kangaroo courts" which are really just predetermined matters where there are nothing but employees of a de-facto corporation selling something and trying to force me to buy it. And what they are offering is the illusion of freedom, and not actual freedom !

THE LAW in this matter is clear, and I WILL NOT TOLERATE the failure of ANY

member of the Sheriff's office to fail to distinguish between statutory rules and laws. As of this

moment, the Sheriff's office is being notified of this matter, and the Sheriff’s office is NOT a

named party to this complaint.

But should the Sheriff's office fail to act in this matter and vacate and nullify this most egregious unlawful act by a body claiming to be a court, I will have no other choice, employing all PEACEFUL and LAWFUL remedy at law to defend the rights I have a DUTY to assert claim and exercise.

The most important issue here, is that I truly do NOT understand the CAUSE and

NATURE of this alleged charge: "adoption of rules and regulation of migratory birds".

I DO NOT UNDERSTAND what it means, or how I could have been PROVEN to be guilty, when no one seems to even be able to explain to me what this means.

I am not seeking legal advice nor do I require the services of an attorney. I am very competent in matters of LAW. These consentual statutory charges do not even make sense in the statutory realm.

Just to be clear, the judge and prosecutor KNEW they could never prove to a jury that I committed this offense, and that is exactly why they have violated a lawful right to a trial by jury of my peers in ANY matter that exceeds 20 dollars, AND there is not even an eye witness testimony alleging THIS OFFENSE. The only evidence entered was **photocopies** of photographs, and for all intent and purposes these could easily be photoshoped to substantiate the claim!

The transcript of the "trial" proves that there was no eyewitness testimony with firsthand and personal knowledge to substantiate and relate to this charge.

THIS is exactly why I claim now under OATH and penalty of law that the outcome of this proceeding I believe was predetermined, and that as ALL of the statements made herein are true, and EVERYTHING that came of these proceedings is hereby VOID and ineffective for any lawful purpose.

I hereby attest, State, Claim and otherwise Swear that I have personal knowledge of the

foregoing facts and that ALL statements are true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I

furthermore swear that this communication is an offer of discussion in common law, a notice

intended to avoid conflict, and that it is being sent in good faith without intent to cause undue

harassment or harm, but in the fulfillment and discharge of my lawful DUTY to claim,

exercise, and defend rights to ensure that they exist for future generations.

Sincerely,

Marcus Loring; de la Houssaye

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Marcus Loring; de la Houssaye February 11, 2013

Agent and authorized representative of the accused

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Witness #1

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Witness #2

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Witness #3

NOTARY:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_