

All Judges take the Judicial Oath when they are sworn in:

“I will well and truly serve our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth the Second, in the office of Justice of the Peace/Judge, and I will do right to all manner of people after the laws and usages of the realm without fear or favour, affectation or ill-will”

‘Administrative Law’ (so called) forms no part of ‘the laws and usages of the realm’ - which Judges swear to the Sovereign to uphold via Promissory Oath that binds them to a specific course of conduct – otherwise they cannot be said to perform their judicial duties impartially.

Performing administrative acts on behalf of the executive is incompatible with the terms of the Oath, which Judges take when they are created under Section 2 of the Promissory Oaths Act 1868, which every Judge must take. A breach of that Oath is perjury.

If the argument is that Common Law has no basis in administrative law proceedings (and therefore is irrelevant), it should be noted that administrative law has not been sanctioned by Parliament. It should also be noted that the crime of murder is a Common Law crime (“manslaughter”, etc. are Statutory ... but “murder” still remains Common Law). Thus to disavow the Common Law, disavows the crime of murder. The consequence would be that someone could pre-meditate to take the life of another (without, necessarily, requiring any reason whatsoever!), **and no crime would have been committed in that a circumstance**. This is the absurd position we would all be in, without the protection of the Common Law.

“Actions which overthrow and subvert the laws and Constitution of the Kingdom and which would lead to the destruction of the Constitution are unlawful”.

The case of R V Thistlewood (1820) established that ***“To destroy the Constitution of the country is an act of treason”***.

Halsbury’s Administrative Law 2011 confirms that administrative law is (nothing more than) an arrangement between the Executive and the Judiciary. And that the Law is absolutely clear on this subject. There is NO authority for administrative courts in this country, and NO Act could be passed to legitimise them. (SPECIFIC REFERENCES TO FOLLOW ...)

Statement of Offence:

Administering an unlawful Oath, contrary to Section 13 of the Statutory Declarations Act 1835.

Particulars of Offence:

.....(+ being a Judge/Magistrate (-) for the county of
.....(+ on the day of unlawfully administered
an Oath to (+) in a manner which the said
Judge/Magistrate (-) had no jurisdiction, namely:

The Judge/Magistrate (-) has sworn an Oath to well and truly serve our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth the Second in the Office of Judge/Magistrate (-), and to do right by all manner of people after the laws and usages of this realm, without fear or favour, affectation or ill-will.

The aforesaid Oath does not authorize any Judge/Magistrate (-) in the Common Law Jurisdiction of England and Wales to adjudicate any Hearing in which the matter is to be decided in any way other than by a Jury. Furthermore, in the Hearing in question there was no Injured Party, no *corpus delecti*, and no Defendant. Therefore the Common Law Oath under which the Judge/Magistrate (-) claimed authority is unlawful and constitutes an offence contrary to Section 13 of the Statutory Declarations Act 1835. The fact that the Judge/Magistrate (-) sat is considered to be *prima facie* evidence of the offence.

("-" = delete as applicable; "+" = insert name, as applicable)