

CROSS CLAIM:

In defending against the criminal conspiracy, that is organized crime in America through its courtrooms: the foundation is, that the perpetrator of an attack/ shall not hide behind the term lawyer; nor shall he or she be protected from using that courtroom to extort money. Nothing legitimate exists where justice, fair play, and the foundation of democracy itself; becomes “the blackmailer (pay what we want) and extortionist (pay or this gets worse)” hiding behind the assertion of: “my client”. When in fact the demand for payment is primarily from, and ultimately created by: the lawyer, in pursuit of money.

The physical entity of lawyer dissolves in the construction of a claim that grants to the lawyer a fee: that outweighs all forms of justice. “i.e.”; that all acts and all intents within a courtroom justified by the state of IL: should be and are contracted to therein, for the clear purpose: to establish, TRUTH/ EVIDENCE/VALUE/ AND FAIR PLAY! The quality of a just action, and a justified purpose within democratic constraints; are fully fundamentally demanded by constitutional guarantee and all of its subsequent laws. We then set out to establish by impartial judgment (allowing NO collusion): the true measurement of value, as is depicted by a lawyer seeking to gain \$333,333.00 from a minimal (no true legal grounds) lawsuit. Or more distinctly: the lawyer must (show the work, construct a legitimate cause for action; and prove his or her cost is justified). That legal right, to attack this business: cannot be determined by an accident not only caused, but established; by the deceased: with only a minimum relationship, to the business being attacked.

Separate from the *“lawyer induced claim and contract of: a*

million dollars"/ a third or more being YOU will pay, to me: as is the basis of all conspiracies.

Assembles the path, where justice does not guard: *To take what does not belong to us, by force against you. A courtroom defined by force/ is not a courtroom created for justice.*

The concerted lawyer action: to make an unsupported claim/ to aid and abet the assault. Which is to financially injure and contort the relationship of a job/ to the assignment of a liability. By assuming there is a connection between this cause and effect. There is not. Instead the lawyer and client: To further the damage caused by just one individual; now inflicts a continuation of that damage upon the lives of others.⁴⁷ F Supp 395, 400-01. for financial gain, and no other cause.

We then conceive of and confront: the lawyer and his or her client; as an agreed upon partnership, to gain control and payment over a large sum of money; by the solicitation of a crime. The connection to this business does not stand up to the test of minimum proof of involvement by the business. To demand what does not belong to you/ to violate the sanctity of a life lost, by using that life deceased: strictly, for financial gain.

In turning to the accident itself: **the question of guilt, therefrom liability** (*which is the foundation of cause, and therefrom the demand for payment*). Arises NOT upon the value of the person, business, or insurance to be sued/ but upon the cause of the accident itself. Where there **is no critical guilt**, there is no cause for a legal remedy. Because that exceeds the jurisdiction of a courtroom: which is equity in all things. If the cause is entirely, or nearly so; upon the deceased; there is no equity distribution to be made.

We then seek to isolate “the traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice”/ by constructing the minimal context of this particular accident, with this particular business. 326 US 310-316. fair being: a standard of what is right and proper/ impartial and unbiased. In the balance of conflicting interests.

We turn again to the accident, and the culpability of the deceased. Finding the deceased was driving a motorcycle at roughly one hundred miles per hour; in a “city zone”. Pulling out from behind another vehicle to pass; means it was impossible or unlikely to have identified this potential impact until the moment it became too late to change what then: became an impact on the driver of the car/ a decision made by the deceased. Subsequently, the financial impact of being sued by greed; falls away from equity or right and proper. Instead: Because it is no small matter, to be involved in any form; in the reality of someone else's death. Nor is it: no small matter to be sued, financially; without a true legitimate cause. The assertion of a liability formed from the bad decisions of another human being: rests upon the life insurance that the deceased could have or should have purchased to protect family, friend, or other. He had options/ the impacted vehicle did not (unless a personal crime); under the conditions surrounding this event! The lawyer and client: intent to attack wherever money can be found; by using the court: is in fact no different than a criminal in a back alley, with a gun. “Give me the money”; I have power to force you. But without a legally supported right/ this constructs a conspiracy “*we both gain money, we did not earn: if you go along with me to attack where the money can be found*”. As is a crime.

Compassion is not collusion: but the intent to form a partnership & establish a large monetary debt; in order to collect a clear personal gain by reward; **without sufficient grounds** is. 5 NW

2d 133, 137.

A legal definition, has the right of evidence, and the power of jurisdiction to demand, truth must own the day. While that truth includes the death of a human being. It can also conceive of; a suicide, “going one hundred miles an hour/ failure to brake/ failure to swerve or take corrective actions”: as would be the case, in any sane (not suicidal) life. Failure to establish this evidence proves a suicide/ while evidence of the possibility to avoid, can only create a change of mind. THAT, Does not constitute, or even imply: “the business was involved”. The case is then frivolous from the beginning, or subjects the court to participation in forcible entry, upon the lives of those who have been illegally, attacked. Any development aligned with insurance, falls upon the personal vehicle insurance; of the man involved. The failure to accept that: establishes, there is a financial target, based upon the amount of money that can be collected instead. Which has nothing to do with legal responsibilities for this business.

The finding is: this employee, by ending his work day (*no intent to come back; who then chose according to his own design and desire*) drove his own personal car. Had one task left to do, for the business; **which did not impact or change what would have and did functionally occur with regard to this accident.** That task DID NOT alter or influence in any way: his driving onto the highway, to go home/ where he was found “detached” from the business grounds, by accident evidence. HE HAD “clocked out”/ and by his decisions to prove that, with regard to smoking. He then established: he had in fact taken control over his day and his drive and was entirely on his own personal time. Because: NO “smoking” is allowed in this business/ and as he failed to follow this rule. He had deliberately asserted, in that action: you have no control over

me: **“I am no longer working for you”/ thereby free of your rules”**.
Or more distinctly: bank deposit or not, **HE WOULD HAVE been** in
exactly the same place, at exactly the same time theoretically:
because he was in fact, and did in fact: leave work behind. As is
evident in discarding what he is not allowed to do; as an employee.