

In US DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DIVISION, FOR THE STATE OF IL
201 S. VINE ST, URBANA, IL 61802

DATED June 14, 2011

case # 11-2111

JAMES FRANK OSTERBUR
2191 county road 2500 E. St. Joseph IL 61873
<http://www.justtalking3.info>
Vs

STATE OF ILLINOIS
GOVERNOR; P. QUINN
207 state house, Springfield IL 62706
ILLINOIS DEPT OF REVENUE; James R Thompson center, concourse level 100
W. Randolph st, Chicago IL 60601-3274
IL Attorney general: LISA MADIGAN: 500 S. Second st. Springfield IL 62706
CIRCUIT JUDGE, THOMAS DIFANIS; champaign county courthouse 101 E.
Main st. Urbana IL 61801

Reply to:
DEFENDANTS MOTION FOR SANCTIONS

In this matter of sanctions, it is clear simple and sure: that these defendants move to silence and destroy the work that reveals, a tiny few have taken over our democracy. Pretending that they are the law, and they are the government: INSTEAD OF WE THE PEOPLE.

This is born out in the truth, that I have searched for justice/ demanded proof of democracy/ established cases in constitutional law and guarantee/ defined duty as is required by WE THE PEOPLE as a society/ defended this nation, this state, and this world against those who pretend they are gods/ honored the people/ and worked for a future for every child. It cannot be proven otherwise.

This defendant argues: they are the law/ they need not obey either the constitution or democracy/ they need not honor we the people/ they shall not

accept contractual law as is the purpose of a constitution with our employees. They demand an oath is nothing more than manure, and need not be bound to them. They refuse due process, hiding from constitutional law, by a complete refusal to acknowledge that law exists in this case. They prove prejudice with words used in the court to describe me, that are blatantly untrue. They prove bias is a crime in the courtroom: by sanctions erupting from a case demanding constitutional guarantees shall be upheld. They are the evidence, and the reality of corruption/ establishing the charge of conspiracy by repeated actions in courtroom cases that are irrefutable evidence of failure in the court, and by the judiciary; particularly against redress of grievances. A law, and a guarantee of both state and federal constitutions.

Democracy refuses the traitor. That assertion, demands an investigation; and lives as a society or nation by the evidence called law, within the courtrooms of this our reality in time as both state and nation. Requiring this judge to decide: for the people/ OR for the defendants, who have acted against this people. The evidence collected in the various trials that have been established and proven by the plaintiff James F. Osterbur: exist as proof, it is not constitutional law that rules here. It is not the foundation of justice that decides what happens in courtroom proceedings. It is not our law that rules, but those who have invaded to overtake our laws, and thereby dispose of democracy so that they can rule. Such is the evidence of each and every courtroom case these defendants purport as the reason they can charge me money/ and withhold me from court. Let the defense prove otherwise, with substance. And without lies.

Let the defense prove by my own statements rather than their frivolous, criminal, or ludicrous attempts: establishing fraud within the courtroom. A reality, such as is "frivolous and patently without merit"/ at best.

The first amendment establishes free speech/ the fourteenth amendment **establishes due process includes the law shall rule**: NOT the judge. The law is abandoned by the court, and the defense in each and every case. Each and every opinion written by a judge contorts the law, and abuses legal due process in order to achieve its goal of superiority to the law: their claimed right; to rule as a judge and discard the law, and constitution, as worthless. Which they have done on numerous occasions.

Should the defense disagree: **LET THEM PROVE EACH CASE THEY SUGGEST SANCTIONS ARE DUE FROM, BY MERIT.** Let them prove my legal complaint, by my own words, and my testimony for the sake of society and the constitution both state and nation are errant, or frivolous, or incomprehensible.

And if they can I will agree, sanctions are merited. They could not, which brings us to the reality of “judicial opinions and judgments which are absolutely an attack on democracy, patently without merit, and without merit to or for the law; a disgrace”. Not a single judgment cites the law used in conjunction with filing: as is constitutional law. Not in any single case. Without the law, the law does not rule. Making each case nothing more than the whim, or opinion of a judge. That is illegal, because DUE PROCESS is based upon law, and evidence of value, proven by truth, called justice or established by democracy, our law.

Without the law, THIS FILING by the defense FOR SANCTIONS, IS A POLITICAL ATTACK, not a legal one by right. Fundamentally denying to me, with clear intent the very foundation of first amendment freedom of speech laws. Or in other words, TO SHUT ME UP: they want to hurt me, by using the thugs of a courtroom to steal money (can they not do that next/ have they not done that already); and have removed my right to demand the law shall be obeyed, by our employees, who call themselves, leaders or judge.

The refusal to obey constitutional guaranteed right, as is the fifth amendment to the IL constitution has been established and proven in the courtrooms created by the plaintiff James F. Osterbur. It is irrefutable truth, based in a courtroom of law/ and it is verifiable in all its aspects that have not been destroyed by the court; as some are in federal cases; perhaps more. **THIS IS OUR REALITY/ THIS IS OUR COURTROOM AS STATE AND NATION/ THIS IS “the justice”**, those who call themselves our rulers allow. This is the treason. Because to overthrow our law and constitution to claim then to be our rulers, establishes our democracy is under attack. We are the rulers here, by constitutional law; that is our contract with ourselves. That is the purpose of an oath which guarantees to ourselves/ that this employee understands the contract and will obey it.

The assertion of dismissal; from a case in constitutional law/ from these defendants charged with the very responsibility to protect, defend, honor, and obey that constitutional law. Is akin to the judge saying to every soldier defending this state: you ain’t needed here/ go home. “Let us, or let me; take care of this grief; over constitutional law”. Just send a flunky to pretend in court so it can be discarded without cost.

The demand for constitutional guarantee as is redress of grievances to me:

is then tossed in the trash. Had the judge or the defense established a basis or merit for discarding constitutional law; this case would have entered appeals in the state of IL, had I lost/ and fundamentally disagreed. **Neither the judge or the defense established ANYTHING TO DO WITH CONSTITUTIONAL LAW/ but in fact avoided it like “the plague” instead. That is tyranny**, making a game out of what was contractually promised to me, and to every citizen in this state. That is denial of due process as my complaint and that case was entirely based on guaranteed constitutional rights. Refusal is an abuse of power, an illegitimate use of the courtroom in this state. That is a reasonable basis in fact and law for what I have advocated from the beginning. **OUR LEADERS MUST OBEY THE LAW**, they are no different than any other citizen/ except for their oath, and our demand **YOU ARE HIRED TO DO, WHAT WE DEMAND YOU SHALL DO/ WHICH IS HONOR, PROTECT, AND DEFEND OUR CONSTITUTION**. They failed. All parties of the defense, including their lawyer: deliberately with premeditation and purposes intent upon denying constitutional right, **CHOSE TO DENY, WE THE PEOPLE**.

Constitutional law is not frivolous, prove me wrong. Guaranteed constitutional right is not “patently without merit”; prove me wrong. Fundamental adherence to the rights and foundation of our democracy **IS REQUIRED/ IS PROVEN BY SWORN OATH**. That failed in these defendants, and now they wish to shut me up/ because they deserted our democracy, and left us open to invaders who do and have stolen our future, by denying their constitutional duties. **THAT IS a crime**; the rest (avoidance, contempt, etc) appears in trial 10-MR-853.

A lawsuit that stands at the beginning of this trial/ **BUT IS NOT** an appeal of it.

This trial exists to prove or disprove, that the constitution of IL shall rule over the judiciary and the leadership of IL/ or not. There is no other judgment available. Either the constitution rules by its words and guarantees: **OR** traitors have invaded and taken over our government called IL. And thereby this case demands of the federal government called the **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**. To intervene and return that democracy to **WE THE PEOPLE**. **OUR STATE**, does not belong to a tiny few who have robbed us/ **IT BELONGS TO OUR DEMOCRACY/ THEREBY, TO WE THE PEOPLE**. **Through our law. These defendants have refused that law/ and that is blatantly and aggressively ILLEGAL. THERE IS NO IMMUNITY FOR THAT.**

Again, I the plaintiff JAMES FRANK OSTERBUR: do hereby establish and command, that it is NOT the continued vexatious and merit-less judgments WITHOUT THE REALITY OF LAW, as has been applied by the judiciary to discard cases. Because THESE ONLY PROVE THE FAILURE OF EACH COURT, AND APPELLATE COURT in terms of redress of grievances

Rather it is the evidence which decides the truth about each case in question. The evidence that proves that not a single court case or appeal has the signature of law/ as was valid or established by merit against the complaint brought against the court. Not a single courtroom or judge, has ruled on the constitutional demand for redress of grievances either for state or nation/ or admitted it into evidence beyond the plaintiff filing. Not a single courtroom has qualified or contained an argument valid or distinguished by constitutional law, nor the framework of democracy, nor the validation of justice. Not a single courtroom exists as a foundation to prove THE LAW RULES HERE, instead of the whim or opinion of a judge. NOT A SINGLE courtroom exists, that has proven the judiciary is in compliance with the constitutional demand either state or nation that is “redress of grievances” for the people; their right/ their law/ their guarantee: DENIED. THAT IS ILLEGAL/ a criminal conspiracy, and a felony crime called treason. Not a single courtroom has proven, it is this democracy they protect. Not a single judge has proven obedience to his or her oath of office, or leader. Not a single time has reality proven, that our democracy as state or nation is not being attacked/ by those who would rob us of democracy itself. Using mock trials, and various innuendo to defraud and deny that WE THE PEOPLE actually exists. Instead, they prove their actual defined intent: “We few/ shall rule us all”. The law has no meaning/ the courtroom is a farce, and filled by the incursion of those who mean to, and have done us harm; by invading our democracy and dominating it with their personal control.

This I am sanctioned for. This I am politically attacked for (shut him up). This I am denied my constitutionally guaranteed right of free speech for/ because there are traitors among us. That must be removed from office.

I ASK FOR AND THEN DEMAND: REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES ACCORDING TO THE LAW, THAT IS OUR CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEE. In trial 10-MR-853. I ASK FOR AND DEMAND IN TRIAL 11-

2111 PROVE THE CONSTITUTION RULES THIS STATE OF ILLINOIS/
THAT WE ARE A DEMOCRACY, AND ESTABLISH THE LAW/ PUNISH
THOSE WHO DISGRACE THEIR OATH.

I AM DENIED IN STATE TRIAL, AND ATTACKED; clear evidence we
the people, have been betrayed. An act of treason against us, the intent to destroy
our democracy; as a state and nation. Democracy is the rule of law; NOT the
rule of a judge or a leader/ but the laws we the people have agreed to by the
contract that binds us together: which is the constitution, and its foundation
documents. I AM DENIED THAT CONTRACT. Those who stand against me,
in a court of law to refuse that contract to me and to our society: are at war with
us. Prove it is not so/ because the circuit court proves in this state, the constitution
is trash. That, is an act of war. The federal court must choose as well: our
democracy, or those who defy it.

Even though I don't give a damn about "leaders without honor"/ let the
people decide. I DO CARE about our future as both state and nation. Making this
a job, NOT a desire/ but a reality that must be served, because we are in trouble as
state/ nation/ and world. The threats are real. AS HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED
BY various TRIAL FILINGS from this plaintiff. The evidence proves, we can
lose everything. We are attacked and denied our democracy, as WE THE
PEOPLE; as redress of grievances, and more. AS HAS been established by trial
filings of the defense and judiciary in each case.

Prove me wrong. OR any action that contains sanctions against me must
describe a court out of control: Because neither the law, nor the truth that is
called evidence; rules here. Only the essence of communism: "We the few,
shall decide EVERYTHING/ OWN EVERYTHING BY FRAUD AND DECEIT/
AND RULE everything, because we have power over you." We own the weapon,
called a court. **And that is also against the law. A traitorous development
against democracy itself. The court is ours, and you betray us all.**

**In cases as are provided by the defense: each and every lawsuit clearly
establishes one of two things/ "They cannot be both".**

**EITHER THE PLAINTIFF HAS CAUSE TO FILE/ OR
THE JUDICIARY IS EITHER PREJUDICE AGAINST THIS PLAINTIFF
(pro se litigation), OR IN DENIAL OF THE LAW, AND
CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEE.**

I therefore demand of this federal court: to establish which is true? Because truth is the foundation of a determination CALLED JUSTICE; IS IT NOT?

THERE CANNOT BE, this accumulation of cases without substance or evidence one or the other of these assertions is true. It is the job of the federal court to prove what is true, PRIOR to its decision. Anything less is simply tyranny, the destruction of our fourteenth amendment. That decision within a court case is the destruction of constitutional law as well/ its guarantee to every citizen nothing more than trash. An act of war against society with the intent to deny democracy by destroying its foundation from within. An act of treason.

Does not rule 11; demand a responsibility exists upon this court to find the truth. Simply establish the law under which these cases were dismissed in accordance with what shall be known as justice. Nothing more or less. Simple and plain.

But this I give you for free: You may discard this case, IF YOU PROVE AND ESTABLISH REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES, for both state and nation.

It is the establishment of a constitutional guarantee: MY DEMAND FROM THE BEGINNING. How is that frivolous or patently without merit? Answer the question.

The question of law is not a game. Is that not the fact of a courtroom? If the question then presented to the court is not about “winners or losers”/ then it is about life or death for society, our future, and our world. It is about justice, and the call for democratic authority as is WE THE PEOPLE. That we may choose for ourselves as the owners of this society/ this democracy for life.

Pending cases: 2257 has been decided, and now exists by preliminary filing sent to the district court and defendants, as a case presented to the US supreme court: prior to printing. Because 2257 was a case about redress of grievances too/ a case about accountability in government employees. A demand thereby to protect and defend our constitution, honor our democracy, by adhering to the law called redress, and respect this people; as well as simple redress: we have a right to decide for ourselves. It has been denied, without cause/ merely delusions of the judge; as is consistent with the court system of this USA and state of IL. And the evidence presented here.

Pending 2277: is a case of threats that clearly and certainly exist with the potential to exterminate our lives from this earth/ it is the demand: that WE THE PEOPLE SHALL NOT have our lives gambled with/ UNLESS we have our own say, by vote. As to whether these few people can play with life or death for a world, for our nation, or state: the truth is, THEY ARE TERRORISTS, FUNDED BY US GOVERNMENT. Still pending, while threats of extinction, grow ever more severe.

Pending 2023; is a case of liberty (the right of we the people to choose for ourselves, the society we are entitled too)/ versus those whose only concern is money, and greed/ power and pride; and they do make us the people within the same environment they have chosen to invade; their slaves. Because without liberty, and justice within the court; we have no say. The question pending: Is that, what democracy means in America/ the money shall rule over us? Where is our democracy? Where is the meaning of life! Still pending, the court cannot decide what democracy is. I say to you; it is the rule of law, that we the people agree to by constitutional rule. Our law rules, not your money.

Prove these are frivolous or patently without merit. Prove the court has no responsibility or jurisdiction here/ because denial is fraud, and it is betrayal. The removal of such cases from a courtroom by such judicial dysentery is desertion. You want honor, prove you serve this democracy, this people, and obey constitutional law; establish redress/ and I will honor you. Fail to accept your duty, or apply the law to your decision in good faith arguments, which deal with the constitutional issues presented, and I will not.

The continual lies about frivolous, incomprehensible, etc are merely assertions: the law does not matter here/ because we the defendants control the court. That is a rebellion established, a democracy in ruins. The pattern of activity most in view here is simple: I demand the law shall be obeyed/ the court and these defendants squirm and deny the law exists, consistently committing “first degree, forcible detention” of constitutional law/ denial of due process. By refusal to accept the law submitted which is constitutional. They refuse to obey, they refuse to acknowledge this law, that this guaranteed right even exists: transforming each case into a forgery/ creating what is clearly NOT democracy; “we rule ourselves by our law”. They have taken over the court/ they have invaded our lives and changed our democracy from truth, into lies; an act of war.

The court claims it has spent resources to defend against constitutional law, that is an abuse of judicial process. I fully agree, that it is theft by the defendants, an abuse by the court they control, against the people of this

state and nation. WE DID NOT hire you to work against our constitution or its law. We did not give you any authority to deny democracy and discard its guarantees, which we did give to ourselves. That makes these defendants, these courtroom antics, and this game; the reality of theft against me, and against our democracy. You have no right to do so/ and yet you tell me constitutional law is frivolous. That is a lie, and you know it/ and have signed your name in court proving perjury exists. Instead of an abuse of judicial process by the plaintiff/ the court deliberately abuses me; changing my life, using my resources, altering my future, and interrupting what I would otherwise do: because as a world, state, nation, and humanity we are clearly threatened with “excess grief” that cannot be undone with mere games. That makes this a duty, and a job, rather than a desire. The resources claimed by the court are as nothing, because the court abuses process and claims whatever money it desires to claim, making the people pay.

Let the people decide: is my demand for constitutional law true and valid and real/ the demand for accountability from our employers/ the reality of ownership as a nation by WE THE PEOPLE: frivolous or not? Its their money, not yours/ you are thieves taking money and hiding the truth that you work against this democracy and not for the people at all. That is the conclusion of evidence associated with your actions. That is a crime, a felony, and a treason to this state.

This case rests entirely upon the charge that each or ANY CASE that I James Frank Osterbur have presented is frivolous. That is the claim. Let the defense: State then in NO uncertain terms EXACTLY WHAT IS FRIVOLOUS, about the filings I present: and prove that is so/ then I will relent. That is the charge before this federal court.

The words of a judge are irrelevant, if not bound by the evidence of law, as is consistent with the truth of any case. The evidence that is proven by truth in these cases, is not justice. Let the people decide. Nothing more or less. Prove the claim of each judge/ prove the cause and consequences of trial, are frivolous, incomprehensible, or without merit by the substance of trial.

Establish the truth; is that not the job of federal court? Either find sufficient cause to establish frivolous/ or define the case by its facts. How hard is that, can you not do it? The evidence is already in your hands. Do include the appellate cases if you like/ after all judges who completely fabricate fantasy and delusion so they can rule against a case: should not go unnoticed.

Judge leonhard proved nothing: he merely gathered some words together to make anyone searching through cases, believe “need not read this one”/ and used

prejudice to deny it. Nothing more or less. He did not respond with law, or merit, and simply defied, denied, and attempted to destroy the constitution, in this case of constitutional law with fraud; a fact criminal in nature. It is a lie, to deny constitutional guarantee: Evidence of corruption. Case 10- 2055 extending from leonhard; establishes collusion and conspiracy to deny constitutional law as is redress of grievances; exists throughout the judiciary: thereby establishing that not only has our democracy been attacked/ they have taken over our courts and thrown out constitutional law. As is redress of grievances both state and nation, guarantees denied. That is an act of war/ by the judiciary sworn to do exactly the opposite. Traitors in our midst. Thieves and liars in our courts. An enemy that must be “cleaned out (removed from office)” of our democracy, by returning to constitutional rule; because it threatens our very existence, as state and nation.

In 2257 the court complains, “it didn’t consent to obeying the constitution/ so it doesn’t have to”. An open denial of constitutional authority and blanket rejection of democracy itself. The court refused judgment at that time to dispose of an appeal. Can’t appeal without a judgment/ so no judgment was given. Much like this case for sanctions: **DON’T WANT THIS NO MORE/** stop him from exercising democratic process and guaranteed rights. Not fair/ not constitutional/ not fundamentally within due process: unless you prove “frivolous”/ **and you did not**, as each case on its merit establishes without the slightest doubt a clear right to have the law defend me. Rather each case proves a conspiracy to deny redress of grievances, by the court/ an act of war, against our democracy; by the court, at all levels, collusion is applied.

That is an investigation established: that must hold the court itself to accountability, by the truth, of its own evidence. **That means at this moment the congress shall be established to determine as the constitution allows: if there is treason in the courts/ because there is clear rebellion against redress of grievances, which is OUR LAW. Let the court itself make congress aware/ it is not their duty!**

Despite repeated warnings, the courts both state and nation have failed to do their duty to this democracy/ failed their oath/ failed their nation and state/ and failed this people and me. How is it, these defendants support that failure, unless they too represent “conspirators of the same”. A demand to rule us/ rather than to obey the constitution, and establish democracy as is: **WE RULE OURSELVES BY OUR LAW &** we establish control called democracy through accountability as is determined by redress. They fail/ that is desertion of duty at a minimum.

The defendant assumes and asserts this state constitution case is the very

same as a federal constitution case; prove it is so, or retract it/ because that is well known to be a lie. Even though redress of grievances as a guaranteed reality of constitutional law is nearly identical in both state and national distinctions. Inappropriate judgments have nothing to do with the merit of a legal complaint. Irresponsible defense assertions have nothing to do with constitutional law/ they are frivolous, and patently without merit. State law and constitution is not the same as federal. A fact proven true, by democracy/ or a reality of betrayal proven by the consequence: without guaranteed constitutional rights, we are a democracy no more. One or the other is true, choose.

The defense suggests that doc 6 of exhibit J somehow identifies against me. I do reject that stipulating for fact: **that each case when investigated for constitutional duty, right, and guarantee according to the law provided by the constitution for each and every citizen determines the outcome, I have not lost a case by the law of merit or substance according to due process as is deserved by me. Even though I have not won/ defendant or judicial fraud is the cause of that.** I have only lost constitutional cases by frivolous and useless statements of the court which prove nothing by law; except the truth justice is not here. I have only lost in the rest by prejudice in the court, or denial of a right or reality/ the refusal to believe the evidence at hand. That assertion of a game, “winning or losing” contorts justice, and denies democracy. Because contrary to the defense argument that there are inappropriate filings: life or death/ the future of a state, nation, or world is not a game/ CONTRACTS and rights. No one wins or loses here, ONLY the future. These lawsuits do represent the question: WHO RULES THIS NATION, WE THE PEOPLE ACCORDING TO OUR CONSTITUTION: or not? You play with me, providing ridicule, at every turn (that is prejudice, plain and simple)/ you play with the constitution disrespecting and dishonoring our contractual agreement as a people, and your own job/ which clearly you do not deserve. How is that law or justice? Explain it in detail.

Rule 11 demands responsibility for your actions, for mine. In democracy that demand translates into: constitutional respect/ honoring this democracy called we the people/ choosing for the nation or state as it is necessary to do by duty, instead of myself/ and establishing justice, while that is possible to do. NONE OF WHICH has been found or proven to be within your courtrooms, by evidence of the judiciary in charge. Which is also a blatant description of people who have invaded and abused the court of this state and nation: BECAUSE EVERY COURTROOM IS OURS/ not yours. You should be ashamed.

THE COURT SHOULD

WHEN THE COURT HAS PROVEN “their exercised powers against constitutional law, has merit”. Which cannot be done. The court attains the right of sanctions against me, which cannot be done. Until you prove by more than contrived, circumstantial, heresy or here-say (such as “incomprehensible”) courtroom objections to the law, by this judiciary and leadership of state. You have failed to properly prove a single case against me. You have discarded cases based solely upon what has now been proven a conspiracy to deny this people their constitutional law called redress of grievances. That is a constitutional legal guarantee/ NOT an interpretation, or frivolous request; it’s the law. The evidence as is such words clearly defined in these filings presented by the plaintiff are known to be entirely comprehensible to the judiciary. This defense, proves corruption and contempt for our democracy. That is an act of war, when combined with positions of power/ when abused by authorities armed with weapons as is the court.

An oath demands in connection with your job: **THAT YOU CANNOT & YOU MUST NOT DISCARD OR DISGRACE OR IGNORE** the values and proof of respect for the constitution, as is required for this job. That oath demands: protect the constitution/ honor this people and their democracy/ **OBEY THE LAW**, and distribute constitutional rights. The court, and the defendants fail on all counts. They prove if not treason/ then betrayal, by incompetence or disgrace. Not the foundation of any man or woman honoring their oath. Is it not “liar and thief” instead? Show me the difference/ show me respect for your oath of office/ this people/ and our democracy by obeying the law. Proving the law does rule these cases, **NOT** a whim or opinion or refusal or denial of the judiciary or leadership in government employ. It is redress of grievances established for the people by law.

The use of repetitive formats, demanding constitutional law, or adherence to base levels of justice in contractual law, or foundation complaints that require accountability in this **OUR DEMOCRACY** according to the potential called redress of grievances. Now stands as direct irrevocable evidence: that conspiracy to deny constitutional guarantee exists within the courtrooms of both state and nation. That fundamentally requires an investigation, an examination of the details of each case, to prove what is true. To identify corruption, and bring our democracy back to this people/ by removing those who refuse to obey their oath or our constitution/ our law. That is a demand of this case. To prove judicial

prejudice/ as is consistently and unavoidable apparent in the cases presented to this trial by the defense: cannot stand. It cannot be both ways: either the federal court obeys and grants the constitutional guarantee called redress of grievances/ OR IT FAILS THIS DEMOCRACY. And that is treason. Its not a choice/ it's a reality defined by evidence, plain and simple. You have no right to deny that charge/ under rule 11 you have a responsibility to the people of this state, and nation. Its called DUTY.

Establish "unintelligible"/ and prove it. Define incomprehensible, and prove it without lies. Identify what is frivolous regarding constitutional law/ and prove it is not YOUR betrayal.

The defendant asserts: "he will continue filing similar lawsuits". That is wrong, I have no such intent. Rather this is expected to be the last round of lawsuits once brought to their fruition. From here/ evidence in hand: I DO EXPECT to "find the public" and discuss our truth as a nation or state with them instead of you. Simple and plain. But that does not mean I surrender my right to trial, to be heard in words that defend this state or nation against those who have threatened us all/ even every living thing, OR ME. This is your last chance to prove your oath is more than manure; before we move to public opinion. Prove That democracy rules this nation, instead of the whim or opinion or denial of a judge, leader who has failed/ etc. Prove the law will be obeyed: establish redress of grievances for the people, both state and nation.

Because this defense, and this court system has failed to prove anything but prejudice and denial of constitutional law/ the value and truth of an oath denied and discarded, by the judiciary and leadership: the charge of treason exists. The unlawful decision to usurp the authority of this nation and this state called WE THE PEOPLE, and replace our law, with your opinion, is betrayal, an act of war. By the truth this as a very foundation of intent is intended to overrule and replace the constitution of both this state of IL, and this nation of this USA. The failure to investigate, before the state and nation itself: IS NOT allowed. An agreement that constitutional guarantee is my right, IS REQUIRED. Because the truth, is unafraid of honesty or honor; that is the foundation of this, my work. SHOULD THAT NOT be the foundation of a courtroom, to be investigated to prove what is true? Prove me wrong.

Proof of service: I, James F. Osterbur DO declare and submit

that I have placed within US MAIL service, WITH first class postage prepaid. A true and accurate copy of this reply to the court/ to each and every address/ defendant; listed herein including the court. Including lawyer for the defense Joshua I. Grant at 500 south second street, Springfield IL 62706 on this day June 14, 2011