

TO HER MAJESTY

QUEEN ELIZABETH 11
BUCKINGHAM PALACE
LONDON

4th DECEMBER 2012

MA'AM; I WISH TO BRING TO YOUR ATTENTION MATTERS OF A VERY DELICATE NATURE.

I HAVE IN MY POSSESSION A DOCUMENT PURPORTING TO BE A LEGAL CONVEYANCE FROM THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND TO WORCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL OF LAND, HARTLEBURY COMMON.

THE CERTIFICATE DOES NOT SHOW TITLE DEEDS, THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND SAY THAT THERE ARE NOT ANY; IT MAY BE THAT THE LAND WAS NOT THAT OF DEMENSE LANDS OF ANY LORDSHIP'S MANOR.

THE ARCHIVIST ALSO STATES THAT THERE IS NO TITLE DEEDS HELD WITH THEIR COPY OF THE CONVEYANCE EITHER.

THE STATEMENT FROM THE ARCHIVIST IS THAT THE ORIGINAL CONVEYANCE DOCUMENT HAS BEEN MISLAID AND THAT THE COPY HELD BY THEM IS ALSO A COPY OF THE ORIGINAL. I, HOWEVER, DISAGREE WITH THAT DECLARATION.

MY FIRM BELIEF IS THAT THE COPY HELD BY THE CHURCH IS THE ORIGINAL AND THE ENDORSEMENTS ON THE DOCUMENT ARE FALSE.

SUBJECT TO PRODUCTION OF THE AFORESAID DOCUMENT, THE WORCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL HAVE OBTAINED A LAND REGISTRY DOCUMENT.

UNDER THE PROCEDURAL RULES ONLY DISCLOSURE OF TITLE DEEDS ARE ACCEPTABLE TO OBTAIN A LAND REGISTRY DOCUMENT, THEREFORE, I BELIEVE THAT THE REGISTRATION CANNOT BE CONCLUSIVE OF OWNERSHIP AND IS UNLAWFUL.

SUBJECT TO THE AFOREMENTIONED DOCUMENTS, THE COUNCIL HAS MADE AN APPLICATION TO PINS, CLAIMING TO BE OWNERS OF HARTLEBURY COMMON CL68, TO WHICH PROVISIONAL CONSENT WAS GIVEN.

YOUR MAJESTY, ALL CONSENTS FROM PINS ARE ACCOMPANIED WITH A SUPPLEMENTARY WHICH STATES THAT PROVIDING THE WORKS ARE NOT IN BREACH OF ANY ENACTMENTS AND BYE-LAWS, THEY WILL BE LAWFUL.

UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE DOCUMENTS NOT BEING CONCLUSIVE EVIDENCE I BELIEVE THAT THE APPLICATION WAS BY WAY OF FALSE REPRESENTATION AND THAT THE OBTAINING OF HLS FUNDING WAS GAINED IN THE SAME MANNER.

EXTENSIVE RESEACH WAS CARRIED OUT IN ORDER TO GAIN EVIDENCE THAT THE WORKS WERE UNLAWFUL, A DECLARATION FROM THE CEO AT THE COUNCIL CONFIRMED NO TITLE DEEDS, OR RECORDS OF THE ALLEDGED PURCHASE OF THE COMMON LAND.

THE CONVEYANCE DOCUMENT PROVIDES INFORMATION THAT THE LANDS WERE SEIZED IN FEE SIMPLE AS FREEHOLD AND THEN VESTED INTO THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONER.

IT IS ALSO STATED ON THE DOCUMENT THAT THERE ARE NO INCUMBANTS, YOUR MAGESTY THE LANDS HOLD REGISTERED COMMONERS RIGHTS IN THE SOIL, AND THE COMMON LAND HAS FOR THE COMMONERS, THE RIGHTS TO TAKE SAND, GRAVEL AND STONE.

AS RESEARCH SHOWS THAT THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT THE LAND IS ANY OTHER THAN WASTE LAND OF THE AREA, IT CAN ONLY BE VESTED INTO THE CARE AND PROTECTION OF THE LOCAL AUTHORITY (SECTION 9 1965 CRA) SINCE 2006 IT IS NOW A SECTION 45 OF THAT ACT.

THE 2006 COMMONS ACT WHICH RECEIVED YOUR ROYAL ASSENT PROVIDES ACTS GIVING THE GENERAL PUBLIC RIGHTS THAT WERE NOT AVAILABLE PRIOR TO THAT ACT.

SECTION 41 OF THE ACT, MA'AM, PROVIDES THAT AN APPLICATION CAN BE MOUNTED TO THE COURTS TO HAVE THE WORKS REMOVED. MY EXPERIENCE IS THAT THE COURTS WILL NOT ENTER INTO ANY DISCUSSIONS ON THE MATTER AND WILL NOT MAKE THE ORDER FOR FULL DISCLOSURE OF EVIDENCE TO SHOW LAWFUL TITLE DOCUMENTS.

AS YOUR MAJESTY WILL BE AWARE THAT SCHEDULE 4 PARAGRAPH 6 PROVIDES THE RIGHTS OF THE PUBLIC TO ENFORCE AGAINST UNLAWFUL WORKS, IT IS THIS PART OF THE LEGISLATION THAT WE HAVE AVAILED OURSELVES OF.

WORCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL HAVE FAILED TO SEARCH THE COMMONS LEGISLATION. THE COURTS ACCEPTED THE COUNCIL'S WORD WITHOUT READING OUR MITIGATION AND ISSUED INJUNCTIONS AND COURT COSTS AGAINST US/ME.

THE COURTS REFUSE TO MAKE THE ORDER FOR FULL DISCLOSURE AND FOR WITNESS SUMONSES. SUBSEQUENTLY THERE IS NO FAIR HEARING. INSTEAD WE WERE PUT ON TRIAL AND CONVICTED WITHOUT ANY EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THE PROSECUTIONS CLAIMS.

THE BRITISH PEOPLE ARE FIGHTERS. WE DO THIS TO EXPOSE FRAUD AND CORRUPTION, TO FIGHT FOR OUR RIGHTS TO DEMOCRACY. YOUR MAJESTY HAS GIVEN SUPPORT FOR OUR RIGHTS THROUGH ROYAL ASSENT.

THIS COURTS SHOW BIAS IN FAVOUR OF THE COUNCIL IN GIVING THEM JUDGEMENT.

YOUR MAJESTY, I HAVE ENGAGED IN DIALOGUE WITH DR ROWAN WILLIAMS' OFFICE AND I HAVE WITNESSED TOTAL APATHY TO MY CONCERNS ON THESE MATTERS.

THE STATEMENT GIVEN WAS THAT UNTIL PUBLIC CONCERN IS BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF LAMBETH PALACE, DR WILLIAMS WILL NOT BE INFORMED OF THE SITUATION. IT SEEMS THAT IT MATTERS NOT, THAT THE ALLEGED CONVEYANCE WOULD BE ILLEGAL AND THAT COLLUSION, THEREFORE, MAY HAVE BEEN COMMITTED.

THE ENTIRE PROBLEMS BROUGHT ABOUT ARE BECAUSE OF A CONVEYANCE DOCUMENT, CREATED BY THE ESTATES OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS OFFICE, THE COUNTY COUNCIL.HOW MANY MORE WERE INVOLVED NEEDS INVESTIGATING.

THIS DOCUMENT YOUR MAJESTY WAS CREATED IN 1968. IT IS A FLAWED DOCUMENT. IT IS NOT SUPPORTED BY TITLE DEEDS OR, IN THE ABSENCE, A STATUTORY DECLARATION.

LAMBETH PALACE REFUSES AN INVESTIGATION TO BE MADE INTO THE SITUATION. THIS DENIAL, MA'AM, ACTIVLEY SUPPORTS THE FALSE CLAIMS MADE BY THE WORCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL CEO AND ALLOWS PERJURED STATEMENTS TO BE UPHELD IN YOUR MAJESTY'S COURTS.

MA'AM, I AND MY COLLEAGUES HAVE NOW HAD FORCED UPON US A CRIMINAL RECORD, TWO TERMS OF PRISON TO BE SERVED, WHICH ALTHOUGH THEY HAVE BEEN SUSPENDEd, STILL HAVE THE EFFECT OF CHARACTER ASSASSINATION AND MUST BE DECLARED WHEN MAKING APPLICATIONS FOR A PASSPORT AND THE LIKE.

YOUR MAJESTY, THE CHURCH PREACHES WHAT IT DOES NOT PRACTICE AND IN THIS SITUATION WILL NOT OBSERVE THE REASONS AND MORALS FOR WHICH THE CHURCH WAS FOUNDED.

THE ACTIONS OF THE CHURCH DOES NOT BESTOW ANY REASON TO BELIEVE WHAT IS WRITEN, OR TO HAVE TRUST IN THOSE THAT CLAIM TO FOLLOW WHAT THE CHURCH STANDS FOR.

I AM MA'AM YOUR MAJESTY'S LOYAL SUBJECT

TONY BARNETT

CC DR ROWAN WILLIAMS, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY