

A Court Order which has a seal or stamp is called in law a 'conformed' version. The legal profession want you to believe it is valid, even if it is unsigned or unsealed when somebody serves it on you. This is nonsense. It is nonsense also if it is served as a photocopy.

The people in the legal industry will tell you to visit to the courthouse where YOU can buy a copy of the original ! But this too is nonsense. A Court Order must be signed and sealed and must be shown to be the ORIGINAL when it is served. Without which any person is fully entitled to doubt its authenticity.

It is NOT the job of a person himself/herself to seek for an Order from some file somewhere else which is supposedly to be served on him in the first place ! The defendant is fully entitled to refuse any version of a Court Order which lacks such basic proof as the signature of the Judge and/or the seal of the court which supposedly issued it. In the same way we can reasonably refuse a photocopied banknote or passport.

A Court Order is only deemed to be 'served' if it conforms/complies with the rules of issuing Court Orders and NOT if that process is deficient in respect of it being a photocopy or of it lacking a seal or signature. Since, in such a case, there are good grounds for doubting its authenticity.

I would tell the server of the notice that he has a job to do and that I do not accept any Court Order unless it is the original and is presented to me in a form that is signed/sealed by the Court. Since (I would explain) I have good grounds to doubt its authenticity and I refuse to accept any copy as proof of it being genuine. Nor has any Court Order been SERVED on me unless/until it IS the original. Since, once again, there are fair and reasonable grounds for doubting its validity.

The onus is on the SERVER of the Court Order to SERVE the court order. Clearly so. Nobody else. He/she has not served any legitimate Court Order if he/she serves only a photocopy or one which is lacking a signature or court seal.

Tell him/her to do their job. And refuse to accept it as genuine until they do - politely giving the fair and reasonable grounds for refusing it in any other form. It is fair and reasonable to have the original Court Order signed and sealed at the time when he/she serves it for it to be genuinely served on me. And not until then.

You ask for the legal grounds of such an argument. Gladly. It's the Golden Rule. To do to others as we would have done unto ourselves. This enshrined within the Common Law. Since I would not wish to serve anyone with what is claimed to be a legal document unless it is an original signed and sealed by the Court who claims to have issued it. That job is not mine or yours. It's the job of the Court and of those whose job it is to serve such Orders.

You are fully entitled to plead the Golden Rule under Common Law in such a case.

And here are some examples of the truth of this -

1. 'Historia Placitorum Coronae' (1736) - Sir Matthew Hale

2. Blackstone, 'Commentaries on the Laws of England' (iv) - (1765)

3. 'Written 'Decision on Williams Case' - 'The Christian religion is part of the Law of England' - (Lloyd Kenyon - 1st Baron Kenyon - 1797).

Your defence for refusing any version of a Court Order whose genuineness is doubted is the Golden Rule. And the SERVER MUST serve a genuine original, signed and sealed document. Or else he has served nothing and you do not accept it. Stand your ground on the Golden Rule - a fundamental part of the Common Law.  
[wat tyler](#)

**Posts:** 1184

**Joined:** Sun Apr 26, 2009 7:29 pm