

Elements Required to prove a Criminal Matter.

Without a valid cause of action there is no corpus delicti. If there is no corpus delicti a case has no standing. In order to have a corpus delicti a case required a valid cause of action as you know a valid cause of action. A valid case of action has 3 elements. 1: A violation of a legal right, 2: Damage or injury, 3:Redress-ability by the court. If the prosecutor fails to meet all three elements required to file a cause of action, then, the prosecutor has no standing, and so the court has no jurisdiction. After establishing that no one's legal rights have been violated everything after that is besides the point. For example: Pretend your in a court as a defendant who was arrested for having a couple of bags of weed. Before anything else I'd ask the judge does corpus delicti apply in the case? They can only answer yes because corpus delicti literally is the essence of the supposed criminal act. Then I'd ask the prosecutor "did you file a valid cause of action against me?" Of course they have to answer yes, because if they answer no, then, they just said they don't have a valid case against you. So after they answer yes, I'd ask them "how many elements are in a cause of action?" Any argument by the prosecutor as to why that is not germane to the case is flatly wrong because these elements are central to the case. So of course they're going to have to answer there's three required elements. Then I'd ask the prosecutor what are these three elements. By answering, the prosecutor themselves are going to be impeaching their own case because they will not be able to site any injury or damage, or, violation of a legal right to anybody.

They will not have any evidence of a complaining party, nor will they be able to cite an imagined aggregate known as a state as the injured party because the government itself through numerous cases has ruled the government isn't obligated to protect the public. This is as a result of protecting the government from law suits when they fail to protect, even in cases where there is restraining order. Basically what is going on here is the constitution lays out why we have a government, which is to protect and maintain "individual rights". Well, that then is also what the jurisdiction of the court and the police is going to be limited to. Anything beyond that is acting in ultra vires. So these become central questions as to what the court is doing. That's why all the case's on standing and corpus delicti deal on violation of legal right. So, say, if you were growing a back yard full of weed, have you violated anyone's legal rights??? No. So does the court have jurisdiction, or, the plaintiff have standing? No and no. These are points that the courts are not happy to get into because they don't like getting into their own rules when their own rules don't benefit them. This kind of defending of your rights will likely prompt intervention and threats from judge. Of course all the while maintaining a level of honour so as not to get into a condition of conflict to stave off a valid charge of contempt. The questions I'd ask the judge if he or she was trying to intervene against my questions in regard to my rights. I'd first ask the judge if I had a right to a fair trial. After he answered that yes I do, then, I'd ask the judge if it were possible to get a fair trial if there were a conflict of interest. Of course he or she would have to answer that no I could not get a fair trial if there were a conflict of interest because there'd be an inherent interest against me. Then I would ask the judge who is it that he represents? And then ask isn't it a conflict of interest to have a judge. who represents the state who is the pretended plaintiff against me, intervene with my asking the plaintiff questions regarding my rights???????