

# Motion to reconsider or for rehearing

Ian Freeman  
63 Emerald St. #610  
Keene, New Hampshire

September 11, 2013

New Hampshire Department of Safety  
Case Name: State v. Ian Freeman f/k/a Ian Bernard  
DOS Hearing #: 13-8519

Now comes Ian Freeman by special appearance, not submitting to the department's jurisdiction, reserving all rights, who hereby request Michael King to reconsider his decision or to rehear the matter. King, by his own admission based his decision on statutes, not evidence. King also never responded to his unfair treatment of Marc Stevens, he deliberately mischaracterizes Stevens' legitimate objections as being disruptive. Grounds are further set forth below.

1. No evidence constitution and code applicable. During the hearing King stated he doesn't need evidence, all he needs are statutes. He also admitted he had already determined the laws applied to me, this is unfair, King should not come into a hearing having such opinions.

King's opinion is no different than Kilham's and is: the law applies because the law says so. It's a logical fallacy, not evidence:

because the code is applicable

Contrary to King's opinion, he doesn't just need statutes, he needs evidence from Kilham the laws apply. It is irrational to think just because some men and women wrote things down, called them "statutes" that they then magically apply to everyone.

2. Banishment should have been included. It was unfair and King is not being honest about it. To exclude it leads one to believe King was fair and impartial, he wasn't. He relieved Kilham of her burden to prove jurisdiction, he covers it up by falsely stating Stevens was disruptive.

Kilham had the burden of proof on jurisdiction, it was to be proven prior to any hearing on the merits of her complaint. King disrupted and refused to have Kilham present anything. Each objection Stevens made was valid and relevant. Cutting his transmission was King's way of being able to avoid

the issue so Kilham could have her hearing and not provide any evidence the laws of the “state” actually to me.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, King should reconsider his decision or set the matter for a rehearing.

Mailed this \_\_\_\_ day of **September 2013**.

---

Ian Freeman

Certificate of service

This is to certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been mailed this \_\_\_\_ day of **September 2013** to the alleged plaintiff.

---

Ian Freeman

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