

In champaign county court
101 E. Main st. Urbana IL 61801

James F. Osterbur
2191 county road 2500 E.
St. Joseph IL 61873
www.justtalking3.info
www.trialoflife.info

versus

State of ILLINOIS
Gifford, IL; police department
dated 1/ 16/ 12

CASE 2011 TR 022442

RE: The citation for: a failure to come to a complete stop, in the town of Gifford IL. At a stop sign therein. Ticket number 3171 Gifford police. The charge \$120 dollars. **I, the accused, DEMANDING A JURY TRIAL.**

The foundation argument and summary.

*The critical respect needed on all sides of every society, to accept the realities of discipline and establish peace and harmony amongst ourselves is governed by law. BUT LAW, and rules: are an entirely different thing. The law communicates and enforces the truth of what we believe together is absolutely necessary or the liberty to say to each other: that “our living together”/ requires this much respect. **The foundation of that being: DON’T substantially threaten me/ DON’T force me, to do what we as a people voting together, would not do/ DON’T make my decision for me, “its mine, you don’t belong in it”. DON’T tell me what to think, DON’T lead me, and DON’T substantially edit or rule my freedom, with your actions or reactions: THIS IS MY LIFE, not yours.** Liberty governs us all equally/ freedom is my individual right, so long as I don’t substantially hurt you or any other living reality.*

Granted this level of liberty: the essence our reality as a united people/ that forms our combined creation of law, by vote among the people themselves, sometimes is less than wonderful. But every side of an argument deserves to be

heard. *The right of every action or reaction within the understanding that gives to each one their freedom to say, “YOU were never affected, YOU were never threatened, YOU were not involved, and YOU cannot simply make a rule, and force me to do what you say: **because that is not freedom!***

Freedom is the elemental foundation that presents us each one, with happiness. Without freedom we are slaves, or imprisoned. **With freedom we choose our lives to be our own/ because we made the choice, and must live the reality.** That is true of love, life, body, hopes, responsibilities, and more. Without freedom there is hate, revenge, jealousy, and more. Therefrom we do know, that **the essence of peace and harmony in society is FAIR AND JUSTIFIABLE LAWS, WITH EQUAL PUNISHMENT FOR ALL;** and the freedoms which grant I will live, “my own life”/ rather than you attempting to enslave or control me, or I you. Keeps us all from anger, and war.

*So then on this issue of an infraction against the rules, as regards this stop sign case. Let us look at the other side first. That is simply this: those few who have defined the rules for us/ are NOT US, and have no legitimate right to do so unless we agree. **The essence of democracy is: We rule ourselves, by law/ NOT by rules.** Rules are what policing states use to confine and control the people/ they are not attached to freedom, they do not belong in the same definitions. Rules are how the powerful, proud, and selfish come into control over the masses. With rules, establishing fears: the weapons of war/ the imprisonment of people/ the tragedy of life are all discovered. Because with rules, you can avoid the law/ destroy justice/ evoke controls that are illegal/ and assume authority that does not exist in a democracy.*

For instance with a few little words, leaders: avoiding the truth of our US constitution; as stated in the preamble to that document: “Summarized THE LAW IS: that all actions of government employees SHALL BE, to further these ends for the purpose of peace and harmony/ freedom and liberty, for all citizens.”

Instead of that, in the forties and fifties the american military/ political leaders: threatened the world with nuclear bombs, “blowing them up& displacing people, in various places around the world so as to create fear.” The end result being not only nuclear, but biological, and chemical weapons of mass destruction today covering the earth. So much so, they can easily end our lives as a planet. These leaders Obviously didn’t want peace/ they wanted power. OR MORE CORRECTLY, “they wanted to **rule** the world, by fear”. They disobeyed the constitution, and its agreement as we the people.

In recent times the fear that invaded the presidency under Bush; became a tragedy to Iraq, and Afghanistan:(because they left it to go to Iraq). NO CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY to do so, nothing but fear for themselves, and lies to the rest. They wanted to **rule** Iraq, by proving how much damage they could do. They killed or mutilated roughly a million people, in our name. Not a constitutional right/ a criminal act against the world.

In less controversial methods of ruling over our lives/ instead of we the people ruling ourselves, by the laws we create ourselves: *These leaders refused the constitutional law of article 6, US constitution: “1. All debts contracted and engagements entered into, ...shall be valid against the United States under this constitution.”* **OR more simply; the government employees are NOT BY LAW: allowed to run up massive uncontrollable debts! They didn’t obey/ they made rules to overthrow the law/ and they bankrupted us all.** *“2. This constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof....shall be the supreme law of this land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby,*”

So then we come to the law called the constitution, or what every judge is bound to; regardless of their want, rules, or assumptions. That is: **they are bound, to DO WHAT THE CONSTITUTION SAYS!** No exceptions, and no denial, *“it’s the law”*. However in the cases presented by James F. Osterbur demanding redress of grievances, as is the first amendment of the US constitution and the fifth amendment of the IL state constitution: **The employees abandoned the law/ and the judges involved commit anarchy. That is: *the deliberate and intentional tearing down of constitutional law, by those involved: against the United States of America, and the people of IL.*** While the defendants in three supreme court cases included the president/ the leaders of senate and congress/ the supreme court itself/ the attorney general/ the FBI/ and more. *Called to court, because this is constitutional law, and each of these participants swore by oath: that they would protect/ defend/ and obey the laws of our USA constitution.* They refused, along with every level of courtroom in both state of IL and the IL federal venue in this USA. None would keep their vow/ NONE would or did obey the constitution: in terms of redress a guaranteed right to each citizen here.

Or more simply **what is being said to you is: that with rules, THE LAW IS BROKEN, by leaders.** *Because they believe they are then superior. Because they can bend a rule. They then become the authority because you: “didn’t do, exactly as simon says (it’s a child’s game)”.* Nonetheless, the game rules/ because

*the people who are employed to enforce the law refuse, the law itself: so they can personally “play god”. THE RULE, gives them authority, the rule allows them to skirt the law and pretend: **WHEREAS THE LAW, gives we the people authority, instead!** As is redress, OR we the people in charge.* The world is full of examples, of leaders, who will not obey their people or their laws: its not a guess.

So lets look at rules of the road here: the rule of the road is that you must wear your seatbelt, OR you will be punished. *Plain and simple: those who describe themselves as your “rulers” demand they are much smarter than you/ therefore they have the right to rule over your life, invade your vehicle: and if you don’t listen to them, enslave you, by penalties unfair.*

Then they can punish you until you revolt, by using the infraction of a rule/ who can be followed all day every day and not break a rule? So that then after being harassed and punished without mercy: you can be angry, and if you do not submit: “you can be killed or imprisoned for life”; because you didn’t do what they said. As is consistent in many nations on earth. Police stalking, is not uncommon/ by using rules and injustice, people are harassed until they break. By stalking, the public assumes justice (they deserved it): **when in reality it can easily be the rules that were the injustice here.**

Thereby control over the police is mandatory, because as history proves everyday: *those in authority over others CANNOT control themselves.* Therefore we must have law, so that nobody gets to say: “I am your ruler, and I will punish you with society/ because you didn’t do exactly what I said”. **Establishing the boundaries by words and actions or reactions are FUNDAMENTAL to justice.** Nobody suggests that disciplined responsibility should be abandoned. However if there is no threat/ there is no substantive reason something should not be done/ and there is no critical or real interference in another life: THEN THERE IS NO HARM. The rule does not belong.

Rather the rule must be measured by its reality, and its acceptance LIMITED, as a truth. In the case of seat belts, it is my right to decide/ NOT yours. In the case of seat belts, an appropriate example is: a car ran into a truck a few years ago, and then erupted into flames. The people could not get out, because the manufacturer rules say, “all doors must lock automatically when in gear/ because of fear”. The family of 5 “I believe”, people burned: because the battery was smashed/ the doors did not unlock, and the people panicked so none found a way out, they could not open the doors. Nobody was able to help, because they could

not get the doors open either. Even so, many are the instances of people being unable to get themselves out of seat belts/ open doors, in emergency situations. Or more simply **the rules fail/** because they are not fluid nor perfect.

But lets continue with simple things and remember: its against the law to throw mercury/ poisons/ paints/ batteries, etc in the trash. **But your leaders refuse to take them/** thereby providing NO SOLUTION to the problem of what to do. However, **they did make RULES:** that if you do put this stuff in the trash, or burn them, or spill them, or whatever it is: then they can then come to arrest you/ charge you “extreme amounts”; and take everything away. Even though it is clearly there own fault, because there are NO LEGITIMATE options for the people themselves, to do, or obey what the rule commands. **The rule, “works only one way”/ giving the people no rights, and no reality of APPROPRIATE compliance of any kind.** BUT IT ALSO, gives the people in power complete authority to ruin lives, even imprison and steal everything they have, and more.

The rules do not protect us/ they endanger and defy us: because it gives power over us to the few, who then do use it against us. **THE LAW protects us, because it is deliberately designed to be about the “big things”/ so that the “little things” do not overburden life, and we each find our freedom and our liberty as best we can.** Or more simply “I don’t harm you, or your life/ and you don’t harm me, or my life: we each stay on our side of the line” sums it up pretty well. Rules are not about that. Rules are about control, manipulation, power, and especially PRIDE: “I can make you a loser”. *It is anarchy; to democracy.*

The rule of the road involving drinking and driving is another issue of boundaries. The primary example being: that when I was a teenager, a new short section of road opened up, and for years one or more died on that road every year. All of it blamed on “drunk or tired”. Then new signs went up on the road clearly identifying the curves responsible: and no one has even been in an accident on that road for thirty years. IT WASN’T “the drinking”/ it was the signs, and failure of “your rulers”. NONE suggest drunks should be driving/ HOWEVER it is plain and simple that any realistic punishment should be the same for all. Making a decision to text/ making a decision to drive when too tired/ making a decision of any kind that suddenly becomes an accident, when it could have been avoided if you simply had not done that: CONFORMS to the same distinct reality. Someone died or was injured. Same cause, “a distinct decision”/ therefore same punishment; no exceptions. Or there shall be “other methods” such as establishing by a flashing light on the vehicle “this one has a problem”, and may be pulled over

and arrested if that problem is proven to interfere with the safety of others. Or more simply people die because of texting and more/ and the driver goes free. Whereas people die because of drinking too much/ and the driver gets criminal charges, maximum penalties and fines; even more. It is the same offense: a mental decision. Therefore it needs to be a similar and fair punishment for all. NOT us against them/ but reality searching for justice. As an example: there is a woman, who lost her license, due to drinking too much, at least once. To then get to work, she must walk three blocks regardless of the whether in the dark along a highway, that does not have sidewalks or lighting: *which DOES put her in danger*. Or more simply inappropriate penalties and decisions: endanger her/ because of YOUR decision. Seek a better way. Seek a way in which “the rich man” does not go free, while the poor man goes to prison, and loses everything he has including family, work, house, and more. Same offense/ needs the same punishment. In terms of smoking, “the extra special smart people” have separated another group for “lynching”: as without an enemy, they cannot pretend to be superior. In terms of smoking, no other group is attacked more often, even though it is a right/ even if not a good idea. The accepted offense is, “these kill us all”/ but the critical reality is: those who have led us to all these threats, have done so much more damage smokers comparatively are throwing a pebble, as opposed to a mile wide asteroid hitting the earth; as is the damage done by leaders today. Consequently you have no right to abuse or use them or enslave them with penalties either: its their life, not yours. Claims by the “superior people”/ are commonly lies or just plain attempts to rule. Rulers are everywhere: as in the abuse of alcohol, the police have been known to use any excuse to claim “alcohol was involved”; liquor store nearby, can in the ditch within a hundred feet; anything will do. NO, I do not drink and drive/ NO, don’t have a ticket and never did for such/ NO, I do not support anyone who does. But the truth of our reality is: that old drivers, very young drivers, people who put on makeup, shave, etc/ ALL DO THEIR SHARE of trouble on the highway. **Justice is always fair/ it never makes an example: because that is NOT “equal treatment”**. It ain’t justice if it isn’t fair and equal for all.

Your “extra special leaders, with their diplomas: hear nothing/ see nothing/ do nothing, but spend your money or steal it”. They could not hear changing paper and other materials into insulation, so the poor people of a city could find their own insulation; stop the cold as best they can. They cannot hear the foundation of a drug trade is money, nothing more or less: therefore let the addict take you to the dealer (confiscate those drugs)/ and then give them back to the

addict as their reward. The money then disappears, because an addict will have their drugs for free/ and the dealer then cannot stay in business. Any who sell to children are locked up. Any holding over a certain amount are locked up. The rest are set free/ because if they cannot make money, they cannot stay in business. And the addict WILL lead you to them, if they then get their drugs for free. There will be “institutions” for passing the drugs out. There will be NO healthcare for a drug addict who goes inside. There will be camera’s to teach the children WHAT this is/ so they will learn the truth.

IN SUMMARY:

In terms of the stop sign offense in this trial: either establish that the **punishment by percentage of income** shall rule; **thereby becoming an equal distribution of power and penalty, over us all.**

OR, understand that freedoms within a clear level of “not threatening anyone/ not risking any property or environment/ not interfering in any life” IS FREEDOM in life/ your life too. Not the absence of rules/ but the reality of risk, threat, and consequence.

Do understand this: **that these are decisions for us all, they decide what is justice as WE THE PEOPLE.** This is about liberty and justice and freedom: **Thereby the only fair way of change is REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES: because it is the method of change, most democratic; thereby constitutional and in direct compliance with the preamble of our agreement to unite as one people;** both state and nation. For us all.

NOT your way/ NOT my way/ NOT their way: **But OUR WAY, as we the people!** One vote per citizen: we are the judge of our lives/ we are the authority over our society/ we are the owners of this nation/ we make the law, and describe the rule: **AND THEY ARE THE EMPLOYEES.** Who must do: **what they swore to us:** they would do, which is obey/ protect/ and defend, the constitutions both state and federal of our land/ this nation called America.

The purpose of this trial is then DEMOCRACY, for real; because our time & life, on *this planet is literally threatened by extermination.* The day to be silent is long past. The reality of law, descends to the last line of defense: as all your leaders failed you. As a jury, defined by the American people, and supported by the constitutional foundation of law: **AS YOUR RIGHT.** The time to choose for redress of grievances is clearly NOW. **Make your employees obey the law.** **CHOOSE THE FUTURE,** don’t just die, without a fight. Let the law lead!

proof of service:

I, James F. Osterbur, do hereby declare and prove that I have sent in this day January 16, 2012; by first class US mail service/ with postage prepaid. A copy of this filing within the court and to

STATE OF IL attorney general office
500 S. Second st. Springfield IL 62706

and city of Gifford, chamber of commerce
box 308
308 S. Main st. Gifford IL 61847