

IN US DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF IL

JAMES F. OSTERBUR

V.

STATE OF IL/ USA/ JUDGE CHASE LEONHARD

CASE 10-2055

dated may 7, 2010 Small horizontal vanes inside and outside the screening wheels/
on the screening, may help significantly, to haul a greater load of oil to the top.

RE: the appeal of case terminated by judge Harold A. Baker
may 5, 2010

In consideration of his order/
the beginning of appeal

It is clear, that the court understands that I am not happy with the price charged for services I did not accept and in fact specifically stated: I DO NOT want this.

The judge simply discards: my demand to address this case under the terms of redress as applied under the first amendment of the US constitution. Simply discards my demand: to make the state of IL obey, the US CONSTITUTION and apply the law that is redress of grievances as granted by the US CONSTITUTION. IT IS THE LAW. And the judge answers it not.

The judge fails to recognize his duty in applying the law: that is due process/ as I am threatened with NO DAY IN COURT by judge leonhard, unless I do things his way. Which in no way is identified "as the law"/ no judge is the law; in a jury trial, the judge in no way has the right to take over judgment of this case by determining the answer himself. **By law, that is for the jury to decide. The judge fails/ and this judge conspires to retain an authority he does NOT own, in conjunction with the first judge. This is NOT due process. Because a judge is allowed only to conceive and direct the jury in its decision, making certain the process of evidence is fair to all.**

This judge rightly declares the US supreme court is implicated and must be held accountable/ but does nothing in the quest for justice, but assume he himself is unaccountable for his own decisions.

The issues of court return to the seventh amendment which states I DO HAVE A RIGHT, in controversies of any significant value: TO MY DAY IN COURT, BY JURY TRIAL. A judge cannot by law deny me that. That is the law/ and there is no alternative to obeying that law. The judge trespasses against the law, and me; by denying access.

The issues of court return to the fourteenth amendment, which states: I DO HAVE A RIGHT TO THE PROTECTION OF THE LAW, wherein it is proven by this amendment that no employee of government or the court shall stand against that right without the assessment of treason against him. That citizens do have protection from their government officials by the declaration of a “jury trial”. Thereby removing the tyrant, by removing his or her power to decide. It is the people who decide for themselves as is guaranteed by this amendment/ not the judge. This judge stands against the law.

The issues of court return to the first amendment, which states: the people DO HAVE A RIGHT TO LEGALLY PETITION THEIR GOVERNMENT, AND MAKE THEIR EMPLOYEES ACCOUNTABLE TO THEM. It is tyranny to demand otherwise/ it is blatant and true rebellion against the democracy that is this UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

The issues of the court return to the fourth amendment which states: “THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE, to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures....” This **case of which I amended my complaint** in county court: by demanding the federal court make this lower court OBEY THE LAW. That defendant: Is determined to seize my property over a reality of distinct controversy. It clearly points to trouble for the common citizen in financial healthcare differences in power to control life. And as such clearly proves the possibility that WE THE PEOPLE may or may not wish to address this in redress before the court and the people of this state and nation: exists. That is for the people to decide, I simply demand a jury to choose our right, under that first amendment law. It is their decision to make as indicated by the terms presented in this case. Anything less amounts to slavery/ another violation of law, by the court which refuses to obey the people, and their law according to constitutional edict and demand.

This judge attempts to hide reality, by disguising it with latin / just another tyranny intended to control the public by making it impossible for the common man or woman to understand: GO BUY A LAWYER, is his demand. NOT democracy/ it is tyranny. The claim stated remains: MAKE THE LOWER COURT OBEY CONSTITUTIONAL LAW. AS IS THE JOB, of this federal

court, and all its associated courtrooms. The judge states: “We are fully briefed one and all”/ which means clearly HE KNOWS, AND HE EXPECTS ALL PARTICIPANTS TO KNOW EXACTLY WHAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT IN THIS CASE. There is no delusion/ the court knows! That means the judge, being fully aware of the laws that are in evidence here: constitutes a criminal action by denying the law. By denying his job to make the state of IL obey the constitution of this nation. And by conspiring to dismiss and terminate the obligations of a lower court judge/ and the guaranteed rights of a democracy called WE THE PEOPLE/ not you the rulers who get to do anything you want. The law intervenes to dismiss and terminate that opportunity from a judge or any other employee of government. The jury intervenes to dismiss and terminate, the intent of a judge to control or decide what is the law. This democracy intervenes to prove: WE ARE THE OWNERS OF THIS COURTROOM, not a damned judge. But we the people, and OUR LAWS, AS DELEGATED by constitutional reality and truth. The first amendment redress of grievances is our law, to protect ourselves from “employees of government”/ through the courtroom we provide for ourselves. Our government/ our law/ our rights: YOUR JOB/ YOUR OATH TO OBEY/ YOUR RESPONSIBILITY, OR TREASON.

A judge is immune from unreasonable claims or the intent to sway due to any form of threat. This is not threat, this is THE LAW DECIDES/ AND A JURY HOLDS THE KEYS TO WHETHER I AM RIGHT OR WRONG, within the case 09 LM 1414. Not a judge. By law, I am entitled to be heard in trial in this matter: and NO JUDGE can deny my right of access/ regardless of “his or her opinion” of my case. It is NOT their right to decide: this is a democracy/ and we the people decide according to law. Judge leonhard remains within the concepts of this trial/ because his actions in declaring “I CANNOT UNDERSTAND/ what plainly he could understand” is the evidence of fraud. The criminal intent to take away the rights and values of my case and transform them into something entirely different. He is NOT BY LAW, allowed to do that/ because he is not “the king” over his courtroom/ but a servant of the people. To be a servant of the people: HE MUST obey the law, and NOT interfere in the demand for justice. He defies therefore the rules of procedure/ by blanketing the case with lies. A criminal act/ WHICH IS NOT allowed in a courtroom of law. Let the court, declare this is not so/ and prove why a criminal is immune.

In opposition to the judges claim that my guaranteed rights as a citizen of this state and nation are “insignificant or invalid” to a claim for protection from a state which refuses to obey the first amendment right of a citizen. PROVE IT BY

LAW. The constitution states otherwise. Make your case under the constitution BECAUSE IT IS THE AUTHORITY WHICH GIVES YOU THE RIGHT, to make any judgment at all. Without the constitution, the courtroom is invalid, as is the nation called democracy/ and the judge merely a gangster enforcing his or her own rules. Prove it is not so.

As to subject matter: crime in the courtroom of this USA constitutes a valid claim for intervention and definition by the jury of WE THE PEOPLE. Conspiracy to DENY A FIRST AMENDMENT LAW, by the courtrooms of this USA: constitutes a valid and real claim for intervention and definition by the jury of WE THE PEOPLE. The illusions of grandeur and supremacy against the people by the court: DOES constitute an invasion/ rebellion against the laws of this land, the constitution of the people of this USA, and a threat to our sovereignty as OWNERS OF THIS NATION: WE THE PEOPLE. The failure of the federal court system to obey the rule of governance and demand the state of IL SHALL obey the first amendment to the US constitution is without doubt: critical failure by the employees of government which must be held accountable: must be held accountable to their oath; must be Held accountable to the people who employ them to do their jobs. THAT DEMANDS REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES; and a courtroom to define and determine what changes we the people shall make for ourselves.

This case is appealed. The judges, SHALL be held accountable.

James Frank Osterbur