



House of Ward
145 Slater Street
Warrington
County Palatine of Cheshire
[WA4 1DW]
26th Day of September 2016

To Chief Constable Andrew J Cook
Merseyside Police
Canning Place
Liverpool
Merseyside
L1 8JX

Sent by email andrew.j.cooke@merseyside.pnn.police.uk
CC Chief Constable simon.byrne@cheshire.pnn.police.uk

Ref: In the Family Court at St Helens CASE No WA14D00277

Dear Mr Andre J Cook.

It is with great distress that we have been compelled to contact you at this time. As this is a matter that clearly falls under your jurisdiction then it is appropriate that we contact you.

Before we go into any details of a personal matter we would clearly state that We have been for a number of years a Microsoft Certified systems solutions provider for Banks and Government Offices as well as the M.O.D. and that we are fully aware of not only the limitations on inbox by mail restrictions that may be, but we are also very much aware of the compartmentalisation of Government offices. We will try to restrict our mail attachments but in the event that mail attachments are blocked then we will also employ URL Bit-ly Links to the same files that we have in a shared Drop box Online availability. It is the compartmentalisation that we wish to address first.

We would draw Chief Constable Andrew J Cook attention to the attached file PDF document by the title "Affidavit on and for the record.PDF We will also include a Bit-Ly Link to this file record <http://bit.ly/2cAoRWf> should any attached files be restricted in your inbox.

An Affidavit is a formal document and a formidable powerful recognised due process where if the content of the formal statement of truth has not or cannot be redressed then there is a formal agreement as a result that the content of the affidavit is correct and stands as fact. We would note to Chief Constable Andrew J Cook that this Affidavit was served upon the 657 MP's in office by way of email as of the 20th day of February 2015 and to this date the content of which has never been contested or redressed and as such stands as a foundation in fact.


We would draw Chief Constable Andrew J Cook attention directly to Exhibit (C) in the Affidavit which is formally on record first of all to Supplement 2 "A Definition of the State, Chandran Kukathas PHD, Department of Government, London School of Economics, c.kukathas@lse.ac.uk)

It is definitively clear and has been confirmed by the esteemed Chandran Kukathas that a "STATE" (and there is a secretary of State) that a State is a corporate legal entity or company. There can be no denial of this fact. As a State is a company then a company carries a peer to peer relationship with every and any other company as they are all created by the same process and in that respect then the State Government is equal to but no greater than McDonalds.

It has also been confirmed by the Rt. Hon Lord Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA (See section part 1 of the same Exhibit (C)) at the Nottingham and Trent University in 2008 that the office of the Judiciary is a sub office of the same State company and it is conclusive from the Rt. Hon. Lord Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA narrative that anyone in the executive office of the State

C&G. AC&G. ONC. HNC. MCP. MCP+i. MCSE. RBA. Para Legal.
Attorney at Law. No Assured Value. No Liability. No Errors and
Omissions Excepted. All Rights Reserved.





House of Ward
145 Slater Street
Warrington
County Palatine of Cheshire
[WA4 1DW]
26th Day of September 2016

Company Executive office does not come under any the office of the legislative but also the Supreme Court and the Lord Chief Justice himself carries no authority to preside over a superior in the Executive office.

It is no strange consequence that Not only the MP's but also the local authority officers in the local Councils but also the office of the Police is in the executive office and therefore cannot be summoned or held liable for any violations of legislation of the State Company Policy. The material evidence to this fact is there clear as day and has been confirmed by the esteemed Chandran Kukathas PHD, Department of Government, London School of Economics and the Rt. Hon. Lord Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA

We would not that the material evidence that the office of the Police is also in the Executive office is published by the office of the police in the form of the 5000 deaths in police custody with no fault found. Clearly this is also valid material evidence to the fact that there is no such thing as Law. We would state this. Who can create Law and impose that law upon another by an act of force? Clearly this would be a belligerent act of terrorism. This also denotes the fact that before there can be law then the law HAS to be formally agreed upon as to what the law is and that there is formal and presentable material evidence formally on record as to who has agreed to what law is. Where there is no formal evidence as to who has agreed as to what the law is then formally there can be NO SUCH THING AS LAW. Law is a Belief. A Belief is a concept in the abstract which is of no material substance or merit by definition. Where is the validated material evidence that the 645.2 million people have formally agreed as to what the law is and there is valid and formally agreed and signed material evidence of that fact.

We would not that the material evidence that the office of the Police is also in the Executive office is published by the office of the police in the form of the 5000 deaths in police custody with no fault found. Clearly this is also valid material evidence to the fact that the office of the Police force is within the executive office and that no Judge inclusive of the Lord Chief Justice carries the authority to preside over an executive officer within the same company.

A Statute is not a Law. Clearly the two words are not the same. It is not possible to make apple pie out of Bananas. That would be Banana Pie. What is a Statute?

We would also point out the fact that there is a clear conflict of interest where there is a claim being made under an Act or Statute by an officer of government State office that an officer of the Judiciary or Judge carries an obligation to the State office to find in favour of the State office as a Court official is an officer of the State Company Judiciary office and as there is a conflict of interest then any findings of a State Company Court officer or Judge IS VOID BY DEFAULT.

Any act of force used as a result of the judiciary findings is also therefore a recognised and wilful act of terrorism by default.

It is also definitively clear and the definitive factual material evidence has been presented that a Judge or officer of the State Company Court in a sub office of a Company carries no greater authority than the Janitor at McDonalds outside of his/her jurisdiction.

This is not rocket science or complicated.
What is outside of the State Company Jurisdiction?

We would draw Chief Constable Andrew J Cook attention to Exhibit (B) in the affidavit which stands as uncontested fact. We would note to Chief Constable Andrew J Cook attention to that a Tribunal "IS" State recognised due process. We would draw Chief Constable Andrew J Cook attention to attention to the fact that this Tribunal is recognised and advocated by a local authority State office in the form of Warrington Borough Councils State Authority local office.

C&G. AC&G. ONC. HNC. MCP. MCP+i. MCSE. RBA. Para Legal.
Attorney at Law. No Assured Value. No Liability. No Errors and
Omissions Excepted. All Rights Reserved.





House of Ward
145 Slater Street
Warrington
County Palatine of Cheshire
[WA4 1DW]
26th Day of September 2016

We would not to Chief Constable Andrew J Cook that a claim was made under the Traffic management Act 2004 by an officer, Civil Enforcement officer 084.

We would note to Chief Constable Andrew J Cook that this case at Tribunal is also valid material evidence that affirms the facts. Case No WI 05257F David Ward and Warrington Borough Council Date: 30th Day of May 2013

We would also note to Chief Constable Andrew J Cook that in the post War Tribunals that officers found guilty of War crimes who simply stated that they were following orders where hung.

The merits of the case WI 05257F ARE the merits of the case and cannot be ignored. This is a recognised formal tribunal recognised by the State Company Office.

The Merits are as follows.

Definition of Statute from the Law dictionaries.

Statute: A legislative rule given force of Law by the consent of the governed.

A legislative rule is clearly NOT a Law. The two words are NOT the same and it is not possible to make apple pie out of Bananas. We would recommend to Chief Constable Andrew J Cook to ask anybody if it is possible to make Apple pie out of Bananas and then to observe the hysterical laughter that would follow.

“given force of Law by” It is clear that there is a mandatory requirement BEFORE the legislative rule can be given the force of Law OR any act of force formally taken. That mandatory requirement follows the word “BY” and is “the consent of the governed”

We would note that like many millions of others that BEFORE Chief Constable Andrew J Cook can receive dental treatment at the Dentist, THEN Chief Constable Andrew J Cook will have formally signed in wet ink a consent form. Formally giving the Dentist formal legal consent by way of a signed document and that signed document is the mandatory requirement before any dental treatment can be performed and that that formal signing of a formally signed consent in full knowledge and understanding is the valid material evidence that the consent has been given to the dentist.

Where there is no valid material evidence that the governed have given their consent THEN the legislative rule CANNOT be given force or acted upon. To do so would be a wilful and belligerent act of terrorism. It is a mandatory requirement and case No WI 05257F David Ward and Warrington Borough Council Date: 30th Day of May 2013 is valid material evidence that confirms that FACT.


Mr David Ward (The appellant) carries no liability to pay the PCN. The appellant Mr David Ward carries NO obligation under the claim made by officer (CEO 084) under the Traffic Management Act 2004 or any of the other millions of the Act's and Statutes of the Parliament State Company. HM Parliaments and Governments PLC.

64.2 million People of this land have no formal obligations under the Act's and Statutes. Any such claim is fraudulent in nature which is fraud by misrepresentation and a known criminal offence that is chargeable. Any act of force given is also a recognised wilful and belligerent act of terrorism by default.

This is not rocket science or complicated.
What is outside of the State Company Jurisdiction?

C&G. AC&G. ONC. HNC. MCP. MCP+i. MCSE. RBA. Para Legal.
Attorney at Law. No Assured Value. No Liability. No Errors and
Omissions Excepted. All Rights Reserved.





House of Ward
145 Slater Street
Warrington
County Palatine of Cheshire
[WA4 1DW]
26th Day of September 2016

All of the Act's and Statutes and all of the circa 64.2 million people of this land.
Any claim made by an officer of the State is therefore fraudulent by default and a recognised wilful fraud by misrepresentation and a known criminal offence that is chargeable.
Any act of force is therefore a wilful and belligerent act of terrorism by default.

Who is going to sort this mess out?
There are thousands of court hearing across this land on a daily bases, in all of which there is a conflict of interest and a vexatious and fraudulent claim being made under an Act or Statute of Parliament by an officer of the State/Company. If there is an act of force implemented then there is a wilful and belligerent act of terrorism by default.

Who is going to sort this mess out and carries the obligation and authority to do so in the office of the State Company?
That would be the office of the Police FORCE.....

The Police force carries the obligation of service within the State Company to prevent crime or fraud and also carries an obligation to suppress a wilful and belligerent act of terrorism under the office of the Police FORCE Jurisdiction. This would be inclusive of the office of the judiciary which is clearly a sub office of the same State/Company office and that fact has been attested to by the Rt. Hon. Lord Chief Justice Sir Jack Beatson FBA at the Nottingham and Trent Law University in 2008. See Exhibit (C) in the Affidavit which is formally on record.

What is it that falls under that office of the Police FORCE Jurisdiction?
That would be any ministerial office of government. eg: DWP, DVLA, and Needless to say that the list is extensive. This would extend to any company which is regulated or licensed directly or indirectly from the office of HM Parliaments and Governments. This would be inclusive of but not limited to:- Water authorities, OFCOM, OFGEN, FCA, Solicitors offices, Civil Enforcement Officers, Bailiff companies, Debt collection third party companies, Banks. This is another extensive list of jurisdiction that falls under the jurisdiction of the office of the police FORCE and where the office of the police FORCE carries an obligation to prevent crime and fraud and to suppress any applied force or wilful and belligerent act of terrorism from within the office of the State Company HM Parliaments and Governments.

There is a secretary of State and it has been confirmed by the esteemed Chandran Kukathas PHD of the London School of Economics that a State is a corporation or company and by default as a corporation or company then the State Company carries no greater authority than the Janitor at McDonalds outside of the McDonalds Company Jurisdiction or company policy.

We would draw Chief Constable, Mr Andrew J Cook attention to the attached WA14d00277-05-10-2016.pdf <http://bit.ly/2dmoqzD> We would not to Chief Constable, Mr Andrew J Cook that St. Helens Family Court falls directly under the Jurisdiction of Merseyside Police FORCE and Chief Constable, Mr Andrew J Cook. We would also note that there is claims made pursuant to paragraph 9.24 of the family procedure rules 2010 and pursuant to S.24A of the Matrimonial causes Act 1973. We would also note to Chief Constable, Mr Andrew J Cook that the schedule date for the hearing is 05th Day of October 2016 and that there is within this application to the Family Court at St. Helens an application for a Penal Notice.

This would imply an implied act of force where Mr David Anthony Ward carries no obligation either under or pursuant to paragraph 9.24 of the family procedure rules 2010 and pursuant to S.24A of the Matrimonial causes Act 1973, AND Mr David Anthony Ward does not recognise any valid authority of any State/Company District Judge who carries no greater authority than the Janitor at McDonalds.

C&G. AC&G. ONC. HNC. MCP. MCP+i. MCSE. RBA. Para Legal.
Attorney at Law. No Assured Value. No Liability. No Errors and
Omissions Excepted. All Rights Reserved.





House of Ward
145 Slater Street
Warrington
County Palatine of Cheshire
[WA4 1DW]
26th Day of September 2016

We would also not to Chief Constable, Mr Andrew J Cook that the scheduled hearing is by way of a 20 minute telephone call which is obscene and unconscionable. A man can be forcibly removed from his home of 25 plus yeas by a telephone call and a man/woman who formally carries no greater authority than the Janitor at McDonalds.

These are the facts...
However the offensive the facts may be, these are the facts...

Yes there has been previous proceeding at Warrington Family Court but it would seem that after we contacted Chief Constable Mr Simon Byrne for Cheshire Constabulary and presented the same incontestable material evidence then District Judge Lateef was reluctant to grant a penal notice and act of force.

Family Court Affidavit <http://bit.ly/2dmxMQf> Chief Constable Simon Byrne-06-06-2016 <http://bit.ly/2dmwQXK> Chief Constable Simon Byrne-28-06-2016 <http://bit.ly/2d49wi5> HOW-CN-LIEN-0001 <http://bit.ly/1OaNFVK> HOW-CN-LIEN-0002 <http://bit.ly/1s74rMf> HOW-FB-LIEN-0001 <http://bit.ly/1rCxJBP> HOW-FB-LIEN-0001 <http://bit.ly/1TOnGmm> HOW-MSSW-LIEN-0001 <http://bit.ly/1rCyz1r> HOW-MSSW-LIEN-0002 <http://bit.ly/1TzbKBU>

We would note that the application made to the court is to give up position of a property of £130,000.00. We would not that if the court grants an order for sale then the court should also order a cheque signed by the court officer for £130,000.00 at the same time. If the Court does not order up the cheque at the same time then the court would be guilty by default of an act of force which is a recognised Act of terrorism.

It would seem now that Fiona Bruce LLP are now making the same application to St Helens Family Court which falls under Chief Constable, Mr Andrew J Cook jurisdiction and where Chief Constable, Mr Andrew J Cook carries an obligation in his office of Police FORCE to suppress a wilful and belligerent act of terrorism under his direct jurisdiction at St Helens Family Court.

This will also be forwarded to Chief Constable Mr Simon Byrne for Cheshire Constabulary and published on available public media. We will note the same to all parties involved inclusive of Countrywide PLC trading as Entwistle Green estate agents who have been engaged without our agreement to place the property of 145 Slater Street, Warrington on the market for sale. We note once again a wilful and premeditated belligerent intent and act of terrorism. We will not and cannot tolerate this repeated wilful and premeditated belligerent intent and act of terrorism.


1. We would draw your attention to the following public record.
 - a. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E545q2jAgeQ> We would note here formally that the High Court Bailiff in this matter re-evaluated his options and declared no goods to Levi.
2. We would draw your attention to a recent perfected and published lien's undertaken against officers of the Government and lawyers who have never once challenged or contested the facts OR brought formal charges for slander, deformation of character or misrepresentation of the Facts
 - a. <https://www.facebook.com/groups/798269636907862/files/>

We await your response. Silence creates a binding agreement through acquiescence.
So let it be said. So let it be written. So let it be done.
Without ill will or vexation.

For and on behalf of the Principal legal embodiment by the title of MR DAVID WARD.
For and on behalf of the attorney General of the House of Ward
For and on behalf of Baron David of the House of Ward.



C&G. AC&G. ONC. HNC. MCP. MCP+i. MCSE. RBA. Para Legal.
Attorney at Law. No Assured Value. No Liability. No Errors and
Omissions Excepted. All Rights Reserved.



**House of Ward
145 Slater Street
Warrington
County Palatine of Cheshire
[WA4 1DW]
26th Day of September 2016**

All rights reserved.

C&G. AC&G. ONC. HNC. MCP. MCP+i. MCSE. RBA. Para Legal.
Attorney at Law. No Assured Value. No Liability. No Errors and
Omissions Excepted. All Rights Reserved.

