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| **Response to Objection to Motion to Dismiss** | Ian Freeman  63 Emerald St. #610  Keene, New Hampshire |

**March 04, 2013**

Court Name: Keene District

Case Name: State v. Ian Freeman f/k/a Ian Bernard

Case Number: **449-2013-CR-00206**

Now comes Ian Freeman (formerly known as Ian Bernard) of the Shire Society, called defendant by this court, by special appearance, not submitting to the court’s jurisdiction, who hereby responds to the plaintiff’s “OBJECTION TO MOTION TO DISMISS” filed on February 15th. Defendant has been out of town and unable to reply until now:

The court should dismiss this case due to the reasons stated in the motion to dismiss and also consider the following enumerated responses to the plaintiff’s objection:

1. **Defendant requests plaintiff define “real property”.**
2. **Plaintiff will need to prove defendant is obligated to City Ordinances, specifically, that defendant has consented to be a part of the body politic of the “City of Keene”. Defendant denies consent to be part of the “City of Keene”.**
3. **Defendant agrees that Part 1, Article 10 of the NH Constitution is the basis for the original motion.**
4. **Plaintiff cites, as their main justification for why they want the court to deny the motion, the following excerpt from Nelson V. Wyman, Attorney General, 99 N.H. 33 (1954):** *The right reserved to the people by this Article is not such a broad and unlimited right of insurrection and rebellion as to permit any group which is dissatisfied with existing government to lawfully attempt ... to overthrow the government by force or violence.* **Defendant denies any intention to use or actual use of force or violence. Defendant’s original motion to dismiss makes it clear defendant is engaged in peaceful revolution against** against the men and women calling themselves government aka the “United States”, “State of New Hampshire”, and “City of Keene”. Further, the reason for defendant’s peaceful revolution is precisely because of plaintiff’s use of aggressive violence. Plaintiff’s agents employ coercion and the threat thereof against peaceful people on a regular basis. Defendant has ample documentation of their coercion and threats, including personal experience.
5. **Plaintiff seems confused about what rights are. If one has a right to something, one need not ask permission, or compare one’s choice to others’ opinions on the matter. The right to revolution is a right, not a privilege.**
6. **Additionally, plaintiff claims in paragraph 5 that they are merely “requesting” that defendant comply with the fire department regulation. This case should also be dismissed for lack of standing, with prejudice. Defendant is filing a motion to dismiss with detail on this point.**

**Conclusion and request for relief:**

Defendant reasserts that this is a peaceful revolution, as called for by your own constitution. In my society, the Shire Society, we would call this an evolution.

If this court honors its own constitution, it should dismiss this case with prejudice

In addition to the above, the court should grant such other and further relief as the court may deem reasonable and just under the circumstances.

.

Delivered this \_\_\_\_ day of **March 2013.**

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

Ian Freeman, All Rights Reserved

Certificate of service

This is to certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been delivered this

\_\_\_ day of **March 2013** to the alleged plaintiff.

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

Ian Freeman, All Rights Reserved

\*\*\*\*NOTICE: All correspondence is subject to being posted on FreeKeene.com\*\*\*\*