

SOVEREIGN CITIZEN

IN THE MATTER OF THE LIVING MAN AND THE LEGAL FICTION A FORMAL DECLARATION AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

By; Crown-Richard-Owen; Of The House Powell- Webley

All Rights Reserved; Without Prejudice;

PREAMBLE

This document is prepared by Richard-Owen; a living man; not a legal fiction; not a corporation; not a registered entity; It is prepared for the purpose of placing on the record a clear and unambiguous distinction between the living man and the legal fiction created in his name through the process of birth registration; and to address the deliberate misuse of the term sovereign citizen by government agencies; ministries; courts and their officers to defame; discredit and silence individuals who lawfully challenge the jurisdiction and authority of statutory bodies;

This document is grounded in verified case law; legal dictionary definitions; legislation and documented historical record; It is not based on opinion; It is not based on fringe belief; It is based on the law itself;

Every claim made in this document is supported by verifiable sources; Every source is cited; Every argument is grounded in law that has been recognised by courts; Every definition comes from legal dictionaries used by lawyers and judges every day;

If this document is dismissed as pseudo law or sovereign citizen material without a substantive legal response to each point raised; that dismissal is itself evidence of the bias; prejudice and institutional self-protection documented in Part Three and Part Three B of this analysis;

PART ONE; THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE LEGAL FICTION AND THE LIVING MAN OR WOMAN

1.1 THE LEGAL DEFINITION OF PERSON IN NEW ZEALAND LAW

The word person is not left undefined in New Zealand law; It is precisely defined in the Interpretation Act 1999; the primary Act that governs how words are to be read across all New Zealand legislation; That definition is as follows;

Source; Interpretation Act 1999; Section 29; legislation.govt.nz

PERSON; Includes a corporation sole; a body corporate; and an unincorporated body;

Those are the three categories the law itself places under the word person; Each is

defined as follows;

CORPORATION SOLE; A single legal office held by one individual at a time that continues to exist independent of whoever holds the office; The office itself is the legal entity; not the human being who occupies it; Examples include the Governor-General; the Solicitor-General and the Public Trustee; The human being holding the office is not the person; The office is the person;

BODY CORPORATE; A legal entity created by registration or incorporation; It exists on paper only; It has no body; no blood; no breath; no consciousness; It is created by law; It exists because the law says it exists; Nothing more; Source; Companies Act 1993; legislation.govt.nz;

UNINCORPORATED BODY; A group or association that has not been formally incorporated but is still treated as a legal entity for certain purposes; It exists as a collective fiction; not as any individual living man or woman within it; Source; New Zealand Business Number Act 2016; legislation.govt.nz;

Not one of those three definitions describes a living man or woman; Not one; The Interpretation Act 1999 defines person as a corporation sole; a body corporate; or an unincorporated body; A living man or woman is none of those things; A living man or woman is born; not registered; not incorporated; not created by law;

The law has told you exactly what a person is; It is a legal fiction in one of three forms; It is not you;

This definition is further confirmed by the Chief Ombudsman of New Zealand Peter Boshier in a formal investigation ruling dated 12 October 2023; Reference 598278; In that ruling the Chief Ombudsman stated;

Person is defined in section 2 of the Official Information Act 1982 as including a corporation sole; and also a body of persons; whether corporate or unincorporate;

Source; Office of the Ombudsman; Peter Boshier; Chief Ombudsman; Investigation of official information complaint; Reference 598278; 12 October 2023; www.ombudsman.parliament.nz

This is not a fringe argument; This is the Chief Ombudsman of New Zealand confirming in writing that the word person in New Zealand law means a corporation sole or a body of persons whether corporate or unincorporate; A living man or woman is neither of those things;

NATURAL PERSON; NEW ZEALAND LEGISLATION;

A natural person is a living human being who, by virtue of birth, possesses inherent legal personality; the capacity to hold rights and bear obligations under law and is distinguished from a person-legal person (or juridical/artificial person), which is a non-

human entity (such as a corporation, trust, or government body) created by law and granted a limited subset of legal capacities A natural person is a real, living human being, you get legal rights simply by being born, and you lose them when you die. A person-legal person (like a company) only exists because a law or official document says it does, and it can be officially shut down

ONE; PRIVACY ACT 2020; SECTION 7 INDIVIDUAL

means a natural person; other than a deceased natural person; Source; Privacy Act 2020; Section 7; legislation.govt.nz In plain language; the Privacy Act defines an individual as a natural person; It does not define a natural person as a corporation; a body corporate; or any legal entity; This confirms that the law itself draws a distinction between the natural person and the legal entity;

TWO; CREDIT CONTRACTS AND CONSUMER FINANCE ACT 2003 The lessee is a natural person; Source; Credit Contracts and Consumer Finance Act 2003; Section 15; legislation.govt.nz The law distinguishes between a natural person as lessee and a legal entity; confirming they are not the same thing;

THREE; LEGISLATION ACT 2019

Words denoting a corporation sole; a body corporate; or an unincorporated body include a natural person if capable of referring to a natural person; Source; Legislation Act 2019; legislation.govt.nz This is the most important of all; The Legislation Act 2019 confirms that the default meaning of person is a corporation sole; a body corporate; or an unincorporated body; A natural person is only included if the context is capable of referring to one; In other words; a natural person is not automatically included in the word person; It must be specifically extended to include one; That is a critical admission by the law itself;

NATURAL PERSON; INTERNATIONAL SOURCES

ONE; CORNELL LAW SCHOOL; LEGAL INFORMATION INSTITUTE

A natural person is a living human being; Legal systems can attach rights and duties to natural persons without their express consent;
Source; Cornell Law School; Legal Information Institute;
[law.cornell.edu/wex/natural_person](https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/natural_person)

1.2 THE LATIN LEGAL TERM ENS LEGIS

The Latin term ens legis means a creature of the law; It describes an entity that exists only within the legal system; It has no body; no blood; no breath; no consciousness; no soul; It exists only on paper as a registered name; a number; a fiction created and maintained by the state;

Black's Law Dictionary defines ens legis as;

A creature of the law; an artificial being; as contrasted with a natural person; Applied to corporations; which derive their existence entirely from the law;

When a child is born and that birth is registered the registration process creates a legal fiction; a separate entity distinct from the living child; That fiction carries the registered name; It is assigned a number; It becomes the subject of statutes; regulations; taxes; fines and obligations;

The living man or woman associated with that fiction is not the fiction; They are two separate and distinct entities; This is not an opinion; This is confirmed by the highest court in the British Empire;

1.3 SALOMON v A SALOMON AND CO LTD; 1897 UKHL 1

Salomon v A Salomon and Co Ltd 1897 UKHL 1 AC 22; decided by the House of Lords on 16 November 1897; is one of the most important legal decisions in the history of the common law world; It is binding authority in New Zealand to this day;

The facts; Aron Salomon was a living man who operated a leather business; He incorporated that business as a registered company; Salomon and Co Ltd; When the company incurred debts creditors argued that Salomon the man and Salomon the company were the same entity and that the man should be personally liable for the company's debts;

The House of Lords rejected this argument absolutely and without qualification;

The court held; Once a company is registered it is a separate legal entity entirely distinct from the living man who formed it; The company is not the shareholder; The shareholder is not the company; They are two separate entities;

Full case; Salomon v A Salomon and Co Ltd 1897 UKHL 1 AC 22; House of Lords; 16 November 1897; <https://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKHL/1897/1.html>

New Zealand legislation does not reference man or woman;

Search through millions of pages of Acts; regulations; statutes and rules accumulated over decades and you will not find a single provision directed at a man or a woman as a living breathing human being; You will find person; individual; taxpayer; ratepayer; employee; defendant; offender; licensee; but never man; never woman; Because the entire system is not built for the living; It is built for the fiction a dead legal entity a form a piece of paper;

Statutes and Acts are not law;

They are the colour of law; They are rules; They are rules that apply exclusively to the legal fiction; the registered name; the artificial person that was created the moment your birth was registered and a certificate was issued; The living man or woman associated with that fiction was never asked; never consulted; never consented; The fiction was created; named after you; and then the rules of the fiction were imposed

upon you as though you and the fiction were the same thing; You are not;

This is not administration; This is not governance; This is a system of control designed by the state to impose taxes; fines; levies; licenses; permits; registrations and obligations upon the living through the vehicle of the legal fiction; It extracts your money; your time; your energy and your labour; It does so not through law but through the colour of law; through statutes and Acts that bind the fiction and rely on your ignorance of the distinction to bind you along with it;

Some will say we must have rules for society to function; That argument is a deception; Common law has always existed; Common law predates every statute ever written; Common law does not require a parliament; a registration; or a legal fiction to operate; It requires only one thing; Do no harm; Common law is the law of the living; It has always been sufficient; It has always been real; The state knows this; Which is why it works tirelessly to bury common law beneath an avalanche of statutes; regulations and codes; and why anyone who speaks of it; anyone who asks questions about it; anyone who points to the distinction between the living man and the legal fiction is immediately labelled a sovereign citizen; That label is a weapon; It is designed to silence; to discredit; and to prevent the living man or woman from ever discovering what the law actually says about who they are;

PART TWO; THE HISTORICAL ORIGINS OF SURNAMES AND THEIR PURPOSE

2.1 SURNAMES ARE A MODERN IMPOSITION

For most of human history living men and women had one name only; A given name tied to who they were; their ancestry; their land and their community; Surnames did not exist as a universal system; They were not natural; They were imposed by governments for one purpose; taxation and control;

This is confirmed by primary legislative and historical sources;

In England the Norman Conquest of 1066 introduced the feudal system under which landowners required identifiable records of those who owed them taxes and service; Surnames were progressively imposed on common people as an administrative tool to track taxable subjects; Source; Reaney P H; The Origin of English Surnames; Routledge; 1967;

In Ireland the Statute of Kilkenny 1367 required the native Irish population to adopt English surnames as a condition of interaction with the English colonial administration; Source; Statute of Kilkenny 1367; Irish Statute Book;

In Wales the Laws in Wales Acts 1535 and 1542 under Henry VIII required Welsh living men and women to adopt the English system of fixed hereditary surnames; Before this Welsh naming followed a patronymic system using ap meaning son of and ferch meaning daughter of; The imposition of surnames was an act of colonial administration; Source; Laws in Wales Act 1535; Laws in Wales Act 1542;

In the Netherlands Napoleon Bonaparte imposed compulsory surnames by decree in 1811; Many Dutch living men and women chose deliberately absurd surnames in protest believing the requirement would not survive; It did; Source; French Imperial Decree; 18 August 1811;

In New Zealand compulsory birth registration including surname registration was introduced under the Registration of Births Deaths and Marriages Act 1854 and made fully compulsory under subsequent amendments; The current framework is the Births Deaths Marriages and Relationships Registration Act 1995; Source; Births Deaths Marriages and Relationships Registration Act 1995; legislation.govt.nz;

Common people throughout history understood exactly what the surname system was for; They resisted it because they knew it was a tool of capture; not a gift of identity; They were right then; The argument is no different today;

2.2 MAORI AND THE IMPOSITION OF SURNAMES IN NEW ZEALAND

Before colonisation Maori living men and women had no surnames; Names in te ao Maori were tied to whakapapa; ancestry; life events; ancestors; places; mana and identity; A name was a living thing carrying meaning; history and connection to the land and to the people;

When European colonisers arrived they could not pronounce Maori names; Teachers; missionaries and government officials changed Maori names to English names because it was convenient for them; Maori living men and women were registered under those surnames without their free and informed consent;

This was a systematic process of cultural erasure carried out through the registration system; It is a direct and documented breach of the Treaty of Waitangi; A name is a taonga; The Crown took it and replaced it with an administrative fiction;

2.3 THE CAPTURE OF THE LIVING MAN THROUGH BIRTH REGISTRATION

New Zealand introduced civil birth registration in 1848; Birth registration became compulsory in 1856; The purpose was not to celebrate the arrival of a living child; The purpose was administrative; To create a record; assign a number; capture the name and bring the new living man or woman within the Crown's system of identification; taxation and control;

When Richard-Owen came into existence on 3 October 1966 at St Helens Public Hospital in Christchurch he had no surname; The BDM printout copy stamped Printout Copy Only; This is not a Certificate records the child as Richard Owen; No surname; Richard Owen only;

Four days later on 7 October 1966 the Crown registered the birth and created the legal fiction Richard Owen Powell; The surname Powell was not given to the living child; It was added to the registration to create a unique administrative identifier for the legal

fiction; The living man Richard-Owen never consented to this; He was four days old;

That legal fiction Richard Owen Powell; is the entity that has been taxed; regulated; enrolled on electoral rolls; assigned an IRD number; issued a driver licence and subjected to the full weight of the statutory system; The living man Richard-Owen has never consented to be that fiction;

Salomon v A Salomon and Co Ltd 1897 UKHL 1 confirms the fiction and the living man are two separate entities; The law itself says so;

Source; Births Deaths Marriages and Relationships Registration Act 1995; legislation.govt.nz;

PART THREE; THE TERM SOVEREIGN CITIZEN; ITS ORIGINS; ITS ENTRY INTO NEW ZEALAND AND HOW IT IS USED TODAY

3.1 WHERE THE TERM CAME FROM

The term sovereign citizen originated in the United States of America in the 1970s and 1980s; It emerged from a fringe anti-government movement called the Posse Comitatus; a white supremacist organisation founded in the United States in 1969; The movement made arguments based on misreadings of American constitutional law; American admiralty law and American commercial law; Its arguments were specific to the American constitutional framework; They had no application outside the United States; They had no application to New Zealand law; They had no application to the common law tradition of England and New Zealand;

The term was later adopted by a broader range of individuals in the United States who challenged the authority of government agencies; Some of those individuals made legitimate arguments about constitutional rights; Some made arguments that had no legal foundation; The label sovereign citizen was applied indiscriminately to all of them regardless of the merit of their individual arguments;

3.2 HOW THE TERM HAS NO LEGAL FOUNDATION IN NEW ZEALAND

This is the most important point in this entire document and it must be stated plainly;

There is no statute in New Zealand that defines sovereign citizen;

There is no regulation in New Zealand that defines sovereign citizen;

There is no binding case law in New Zealand that defines sovereign citizen as a legal category;

There is no Act of Parliament; no Order in Council; no Gazette notice; no legal authority of any kind in New Zealand that gives the term sovereign citizen any legal meaning or legal effect whatsoever;

It is not a legal term; It has never been a legal term in New Zealand; It has no application in New Zealand law; It has no application in New Zealand courts; It has no application to the living man Richard-Owen or any other living man or woman in New Zealand;

3.3 HOW THE TERM ENTERED NEW ZEALAND

The term sovereign citizen entered New Zealand through three channels;

ONE; ACADEMIC IMPORTATION; Academics primarily from Australian universities; particularly the University of New South Wales; began publishing papers on sovereign citizen movements in the 2010s; These papers defined pseudolaw so broadly that the definition encompassed common law arguments recognised by courts for centuries; natural law arguments that form the philosophical foundation of every democratic constitution in the world; constitutional law arguments taught in law schools; trust law arguments that appear in standard legal textbooks; arguments based on Black's Law Dictionary definitions and arguments based on Latin legal maxims; These academic papers were then adopted by New Zealand courts; judges and government agencies as justification for dismissing arguments without examination;

TWO; JUDICIAL EDUCATION MATERIALS; The New South Wales Judicial Commission published a bench book for judges on how to handle sovereign citizens; This is a manual prepared and distributed to judges instructing them on how to respond to arguments before those arguments are heard on their merits; While this bench book originates from New South Wales its influence extends to New Zealand through the shared common law tradition; shared legal training institutions and the regular exchange of judicial education materials between Australian and New Zealand courts;

THREE; MEDIA; New Zealand mainstream media outlets including the New Zealand Herald adopted the sovereign citizen label from overseas reporting without examination; without legal analysis and without giving the living men and women concerned a fair opportunity to respond; The label was applied to anyone who challenged government authority using arguments outside the mainstream statutory framework;

3.4 HOW THE LABEL IS USED TODAY

When a living man or woman raises a legitimate legal argument; challenges the jurisdiction of a statutory body; raises arguments based on common law rights; seeks to distinguish between the legal fiction and the living man or woman; relies on Black's Law Dictionary definitions or relies on legal maxims recognised in courts for centuries; the response from government agencies; their lawyers and their officers follows a predictable and documented pattern;

The argument is labelled sovereign citizen or pseudo law without any legal analysis of its substance;

The correspondence contains no citation of any law that defines sovereign citizen;

The correspondence contains no substantive rebuttal of the legal arguments raised;

The correspondence contains no case law that addresses the specific points made;

The correspondence dismisses the entire argument using the label as a substitute for legal reasoning;

The living man or woman is sometimes warned that continuing to raise such arguments especially within a tribunal / court setting may result in vexatious litigant status
Contempt of court or costs orders;

This is not a legal response; This is a deflection; It is designed to intimidate the living man or woman into withdrawing their challenge without the agency having to address the substance of the argument on its merits;

If the arguments raised were truly without merit it would be straightforward to address them with a substantive legal response citing authority; The fact that the response is always the label and never the law is itself evidence that the label is being used because the law cannot answer the argument;

3.5 PSEUDOLAW; THE NEW WEAPON

In recent years the term pseudolaw has been adopted by academics primarily from Australian and Canadian universities to describe legal arguments made outside the mainstream statutory framework; Papers published through UNSW Sydney and other institutions define pseudolaw so broadly that the definition encompasses common law arguments recognised by courts for centuries; natural law arguments that form the philosophical foundation of every democratic constitution in the world; constitutional law arguments taught in law schools; trust law arguments that appear in standard legal textbooks; arguments based on Black's Law Dictionary definitions and arguments based on Latin legal maxims;

This academic framing is then adopted by courts; judges and government agencies as justification for dismissing arguments without examination; The academic paper becomes the shield; The label becomes the weapon; The living man or woman's argument is never heard on its merits;

This is circular reasoning; The system defines anything outside the system as pseudo law; It then uses that definition to refuse to examine arguments that challenge the system; The circularity is the point; The label exists to protect the system from examination; not to protect the living man or woman from harm;
The truth is the language of law as practised in New Zealand courts and government agencies is deliberately complex and deliberately inaccessible; designed not to protect the living man or woman but to obscure the distinction between the natural person and the legal fiction; It is not true law; it is the colour of law; pseudo law dressed in the language of authority that operates exclusively upon the legal fiction and has no

jurisdiction over the living man or woman unless consent is given through ignorance; Under true common law only two questions matter; has a living man or woman been harmed or has property been damaged; because without an injured party there is no case and no jurisdiction; but statutes do not require an injured party; they require only a person-legal fiction and a living man or woman who does not know the difference; which is why the court is a business; the charge is a transaction; the fine is revenue; and the legal name is the entry point through which the state extracts your money; your time and your energy;

The courts of New Zealand are not halls of justice; They are commercial jurisdictions operating under contract law and trust law; Every tribunal; every district court; every high court is a commercial entity registered and operating as a business; When you appear before a court you are not appearing as a living man or woman seeking justice; you are appearing as the legal fiction; the registered name; the artificial person; and you are being processed as a party to a commercial transaction; The judge is the administrator; the charge is the claim; the fine is the settlement and the court is the collection agency; You are not invited to question this; You are not expected to understand this; The entire architecture of the courtroom; the language; the procedure; the hierarchy; the wigs and the gowns; is designed to ensure you comply without question; to ensure you accept the jurisdiction without challenge; and to ensure the commercial process completes with the extraction of your money; your time and your energy without you ever understanding what actually took place;

The Ministry of Justice is a registered commercial entity on the New Zealand Business Number register; Company Number 300001099; NZBN 9429041908907; registered 14 June 2017; Source; nzbn.govt.nz; It is not simply a government department; It is a registered business; and the courts it administers are its commercial operations;

PART THREE B; NEW ZEALAND POLICE; A REGISTERED COMMERCIAL ENTITY

3B.1 CONFIRMED COMMERCIAL IDENTIFIERS

New Zealand Police is confirmed as a registered entity on the New Zealand Business Number register with the following identifiers;

CONFIRMED COMMERCIAL IDENTIFIERS; NEW ZEALAND POLICE

- Legal Name; NEW ZEALAND POLICE
- Company Number; 300001205
- NZBN; 9429041909966
- D-U-N-S Number; 590216123; Listed on Dun and Bradstreet business directory; confirmed by OIA response IR-01-22-29820; Note; a separate OIA response IR-01-24-5821 denied this registration; That contradiction is on the public record at fyi.org.nz
- GST Number; 14-290-451
- Westpac Bank Account; 03-0049-0000802-27
- Incorporated; 14 June 2017
- Registered Office; 180 Molesworth Street; Wellington 6140

New Zealand Police holds GST Number 14-290-451 confirming it conducts taxable activity; It holds NZBN 9429041909966 under the New Zealand Business Number Act 2016; That Act defines eligible entities as businesses; New Zealand Police states on its own website at police.govt.nz;

New Zealand Police provided contradictory OIA responses regarding its Dun and Bradstreet registration; OIA response IR-01-22-29820 confirmed the registration; OIA response IR-01-24-5821 denied it; A government agency cannot provide contradictory official responses to the same factual question without one of those responses being false; Both responses are on the public record at fyi.org.nz; The contradiction is itself evidence of institutional inconsistency in official information responses

We use your NZBN to verify that you are a business operating in New Zealand;

A business is not a sovereign authority; A business has no inherent power over a living man or woman without consent;

A corporation is a legal fiction; It is an artificial person; It is a creature of the law; It has no inherent authority over a living man or woman; Authority must be established; It must be consented to; It cannot be assumed;

Every enforcement action taken by New Zealand Police generates revenue; Every fine; every infringement notice; every court referral; every seizure is a taxable transaction processed through GST number 14-290-451; A sovereign authority does not hold a GST number; A sovereign authority does not bank with Westpac; a 100 percent Australian owned private bank answerable to its shareholders and directors under Australian jurisdiction; not New Zealand law; A sovereign authority cannot have its accounts frozen; closed or directed by a foreign private institution; New Zealand Police can; That is not sovereignty; That is commerce; And every time a Police officer approaches a living man or woman on the side of the road and asks for a name; a licence; a registration; they are not performing a sovereign act; They are initiating a commercial transaction; They are attempting to establish joinder between the living man or woman and the legal fiction; to create a contract without your knowledge; without your consent; and without your understanding; That is not law enforcement; That is business;

3B.2 THE SOVEREIGN CITIZEN INSTRUCTION MANUAL

New Zealand Police has published a formal chapter in the New Zealand Police Manual specifically titled Sovereign Citizens; This is confirmed from police.govt.nz and reported by the New Zealand Police Association at policeassn.org.nz; The manual instructs officers to avoid being drawn into arguments about common law; contracts or the Magna Carta; to assert that those arguments have no legal standing without citing any authority whatsoever; to record the interaction in a security intelligence database; and to alert a security intelligence and threat team; The manual associates the sovereign citizen label with a spectrum of behaviour that at its extreme end includes violent extremism; creating a premeditated association in the officer's mind before a single word has been spoken by the living man or woman standing before them;

An instruction to avoid common law arguments is an instruction to avoid the law itself; Common law is not a fringe theory; It is the foundation upon which New Zealand law was built; Magna Carta 1215 is the foundational document of the rights of free men and women in the English speaking world and it remains unrepealed; The absence of any legal citation in the manual to support the claim that these arguments have no standing is not an oversight; It is confirmation that the claim cannot be supported by law; because no such law exists;

The recording of a living man or woman in a security intelligence database on the basis of a label alone; before any finding of wrongdoing; before any charge; before any court determination; is premeditated institutional bias documented in the Police's own published manual; A private company employee operating under GST number 14-290-451 is instructed by that company to classify; record and flag a living man or woman as a potential extremist for the act of knowing their rights; That is not public safety; That is the suppression of knowledge by a registered commercial entity using the apparatus of state enforcement to protect a system of extraction from those who are beginning to understand it;

New Zealand Police officers now operate with a digital application on their devices that assists them during roadside interactions and other enforcement encounters; That application is pre-programmed; It contains embedded classifications and categories including the sovereign citizen label; A private company employee approaching a living man or woman on the side of the road is already operating from a position of premeditated bias; The sovereign citizen classification is built into the tool before the interaction begins; before a word is spoken; before any evidence is gathered; That is not policing; That is prejudice by algorithm; It is defamatory classification embedded into a commercial enforcement system and directed at living men and women by employees of a registered private business;

3B.4 THE IRONY; POLICE ARE THE SOVEREIGN CITIZENS

New Zealand Police is registered under Company Number 300001205 with NZBN 9429041909966; It is a legal fiction; It is an artificial person; It is a creature of the law; It exercises authority over living men and women through the enforcement of statutes; fines; licensing requirements and commercial penalties;

By the precise legal definition of sovereign; the entity exercising supreme authority over living men and women without their consent; New Zealand Police is the sovereign citizen;

The living man or woman who declines to consent to that authority is not claiming sovereignty; They are asserting that a registered corporation has no inherent authority over a living man or woman without consent; That is not sovereignty; That is the common law;

The corporation labels the living man or woman with the characteristic that defines its

own existence; That is projection; It is confirmed by the Police's own published manual and its own confirmed commercial registration;

PART FOUR; WHO IS ACTUALLY THE SOVEREIGN CITIZEN AND WHY THEY PROJECT THE LABEL ONTO OTHERS

4.1 THE DEFINITION OF SOVEREIGN

The word sovereign has a precise legal meaning; Black's Law Dictionary Second Edition defines sovereign as;

A person; body; or state in which independent and supreme authority is vested; A chief ruler with supreme power; A king or other ruler with limited power;

Black's Law Dictionary Fourth Edition defines sovereignty as;

The supreme; absolute; and uncontrollable power by which any independent state is governed; The international independence of a state; combined with the right and power of regulating its internal affairs without foreign dictation;

By these definitions the sovereign is the one who holds supreme authority; The question that must be asked and answered is this; Who in New Zealand actually holds and exercises supreme authority;

4.2 THE ENTITIES THAT EXERCISE SUPREME AUTHORITY IN NEW ZEALAND

The following entities exercise supreme authority over the living men and women of New Zealand; They tax; they regulate; they prosecute; they imprison; they seize property; they issue demands and they enforce compliance;

THE SOVEREIGN IN RIGHT OF NEW ZEALAND; Legal Entity Identifier 549300237GPHG2AI7C34; Registered at C/O THE TREASURY; PO Box 3724; Wellington 6140; Registered on the London Stock Exchange LEI register; Entity category; RESIDENT GOVERNMENT ENTITY; Status; ACTIVE;

THE SOVEREIGN IN RIGHT OF NEW ZEALAND ACTING BY AND THROUGH THE SECRETARY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND TRADE; Registered on the United Kingdom Companies House register under Company Number OE020656; Registered 31 January 2023;

THE MINISTRY FOR PRIMARY INDUSTRIES; Registered on the New Zealand Companies Register under Company Number 300001091; NZBN 9429000096157; GST Number 64-558-838; Westpac Bank Account 03-0049-0001709-002;

CROWN LAW OFFICE; Registered on the New Zealand Companies Register under Company Number 300000307;

These entities are not living men or women; They are registered legal fictions; They are artificial persons; They are creatures of the law; They exist on paper only; They have no breath; no blood; no consciousness; no soul; They are ens legis; creatures of the law as defined by Black's Law Dictionary;

By the legal definition of sovereign these registered entities exercise supreme authority over the living men and women of New Zealand; They are the sovereign citizens; They are the artificial persons claiming and exercising supreme authority over living men and women who never consented to that authority;

4.3 WHY THEY PROJECT THE LABEL ONTO OTHERS

Projection is a documented psychological and political mechanism; It involves attributing to others the characteristics; behaviours or intentions that the projecting party itself holds or exercises;

When a registered corporate entity that exercises supreme authority over living men and women without their consent labels a living man or woman who challenges that authority a sovereign citizen it is engaging in projection; It is attributing to the living man or woman the very characteristic that defines its own existence and conduct;

The registered entity is the sovereign; It is the citizen in the sense of a legal fiction operating within and enforcing a system of commercial law; The living man or woman who challenges it is doing the opposite; The living man or woman is asserting that they are not a fiction; not a registered entity; not a creature of the law; but a living breathing conscious being whose rights exist independent of any statute;

The label sovereign citizen is therefore not a legal classification; It is a political weapon; It is used by entities that are themselves sovereign citizens in the precise legal meaning of those words to silence living men and women who challenge their authority;

4.4 THE IRONY CONFIRMED BY PRIMARY SOURCES

The irony is confirmed by the primary sources themselves;

THE SOVEREIGN IN RIGHT OF NEW ZEALAND is registered on the London Stock Exchange LEI register; The London Stock Exchange is a commercial financial exchange; It registers entities for the purpose of financial transactions; bond trading and commercial identification; A truly sovereign entity requires no registration on a commercial financial exchange; Sovereignty is self-executing; It requires no commercial framework to exist;

THE SOVEREIGN IN RIGHT OF NEW ZEALAND ACTING BY AND THROUGH THE SECRETARY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND TRADE is registered on the United Kingdom Companies House register; Companies House is the United Kingdom's registrar of companies; It registers commercial entities; A truly sovereign entity of New Zealand requires no registration on a foreign commercial register;

THE MINISTRY FOR PRIMARY INDUSTRIES holds a GST number; GST is a tax on commercial transactions; It is imposed on taxable activity; A truly sovereign entity exercising pure sovereign regulatory power does not conduct taxable activity; It does not charge GST on its regulatory functions; The moment MPI registered for GST it confirmed it is conducting commercial taxable activity;

These entities are not sovereign in the true meaning of the word; They are registered commercial fictions operating within a commercial framework; They exercise authority over living men and women by maintaining the fiction that they are sovereign; The label sovereign citizen is their most effective tool for maintaining that fiction; Because the moment a living man or woman successfully challenges the label the entire framework is open to examination;

WHAT THEY WILL ARGUE

The Crown Entities Act 2004 expressly authorises Crown entities to be established and registered as companies under the Companies Act 1993; They will say this is lawful; transparent; and legislatively authorised; They will say having a GST number; an NZBN and a bank account is simply how modern government operates; They will say none of this makes them a private business; it makes them a Crown entity accountable to Parliament;

THE PROBLEM WITH THAT ARGUMENT AND WHERE IT COLLAPSES

The Public Finance Act 1989 defines the Crown as the Sovereign in Right of New Zealand; It then expressly states that the Crown does NOT include Crown entities; State enterprises; Schedule 4 organisations or Schedule 4A companies; Source; Public Finance Act 1989 Section 2; legislation.govt.nz;

That is their own legislation saying it; The Crown and Crown entities are legally separate; The moment an entity is registered under the Companies Act 1993; incorporated with an NZBN; assigned a GST number and given a Westpac bank account it has stepped outside the definition of the Crown itself; It is operating as a separate legal entity; a commercial body; not as the sovereign authority;

THE SOVEREIGN IN RIGHT OF NEW ZEALAND itself holds LEI number 549300237GPHG2AI7C34; issued by the London Stock Exchange; registered as a Legal Entity Identifier; active since 21 February 2013; address care of The Treasury; A Legal Entity Identifier is issued exclusively to entities that participate in financial transactions in global markets; Source; lei.report/LEI/549300237GPHG2AI7C34; The Sovereign itself is registered as a financial market participant;

THE SOVEREIGN IN RIGHT OF NEW ZEALAND ACTING BY AND THROUGH THE SECRETARY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND TRADE is registered at UK Companies House; Company Number OE020656; registered 31 January 2023; Source; find-and-update.company-information.service.gov.uk/company/OE020656;

So the argument is not that Crown entities should not exist; The argument is this; When the Sovereign itself holds a LEI number as a global financial market participant; when it is registered at UK Companies House; when every agency beneath it holds an NZBN; a GST number and a private foreign bank account; the claim that these entities exercise sovereign authority over living men and women is not a legal argument; It is a commercial claim; And a commercial claim requires consent; joinder and a contract; not assumption;

WHO AUDITS THE BOOKS

The Auditor-General of New Zealand audits all Crown entities; government departments and state owned enterprises; Source; Office of the Auditor-General; oag.parliament.nz; The problem is this; The Auditor-General is itself a Crown entity; It is appointed by the House of Representatives; It is funded by the Crown; It reports to Parliament; It is not independent; It is the Crown auditing the Crown; That is not an independent audit; That is an internal review dressed as oversight;

TWO SETS OF BOOKS

This cannot be confirmed or denied from any public source; No forensic audit of New Zealand Crown entities has ever been conducted by a genuinely independent third party with powers of arrest and compulsion; That fact alone is significant; The absence of independent verification is not proof of fraud; but it is proof that no mechanism exists to rule it out;

DIRECTORS AND SHAREHOLDERS

Crown entities registered under the Companies Act 1993 list the Minister of Finance or relevant portfolio Minister as the shareholder on behalf of the Crown; The directors are appointed by the relevant Minister; They are not elected; They are not independently verified; They are appointed by the same political structure that benefits from the revenue those entities generate; No independent third party can verify the full financial relationship between those entities; the Treasury; the Reserve Bank and the private banking system without a forensic audit;

WHY THAT AUDIT WILL NEVER HAPPEN

A forensic audit with genuine independence; full access to all accounts; all ledgers; all interbank transactions; all GST flows; all fine revenue; all court fee revenue; and powers of arrest for non-compliance would require authority that sits above the Crown itself; No such authority exists within the current New Zealand legal framework; The Crown cannot be compelled by any domestic body it has itself created; Every oversight mechanism in New Zealand was created by the Crown; funded by the Crown; and reports to the Crown; That is not oversight; That is the illusion of oversight; And the illusion is by design;

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER;

Q1; Who owns the Crown; If the Crown is the Sovereign in Right of New Zealand and the Sovereign holds a Legal Entity Identifier as a global financial market participant; who are the beneficial owners of that entity; Who are the directors; Who are the shareholders; Who appointed them; Who can remove them; Who audits them independently;

Q2; If every Crown entity generates revenue through fines; fees; levies; GST and court costs; where does that revenue go after it enters the consolidated fund; Who controls the consolidated fund; Who has full independent access to verify what enters and what leaves; Why has no independent forensic audit with powers of compulsion and arrest ever been conducted;

Q3; If the Auditor-General audits the Crown and the Auditor-General is appointed and funded by the Crown; who audits the Auditor-General; Who watches the watchers; Who verifies the verifiers;

Q4; If New Zealand is a sovereign nation whose wealth belongs to its people; where is the evidence that the people benefit proportionally from the revenue generated by the commercial enforcement apparatus operating in their name; Where are the full accounts; Where is the transparency; Where is the independent verification that not a single dollar is unaccounted for;

These are not radical questions; They are the questions any forensic accountant; any genuine auditor; any truly independent oversight body would ask as a starting point; The fact that no mechanism exists to answer them is not an oversight; It is architecture;

PART FIVE; THE COMMON LAW RIGHTS OF THE LIVING MAN AND WOMAN

5.1 WHAT COMMON LAW IS

Common law is the body of law derived from judicial decisions; custom and general principles; It is not created by Parliament; It is not created by statute; It exists independent of any legislative act; It is the foundation upon which all statute law is built;

Magna Carta 1215 is the foundational document of common law rights in the English speaking world; It established that no free man shall be seized or imprisoned or stripped of his rights or possessions or outlawed or exiled or deprived of his standing in any way nor will we proceed with force against him or send others to do so except by the lawful judgment of his equals or by the law of the land;

New Zealand inherited the common law of England through the English Laws Act 1858; That inheritance is confirmed by *Fitzgerald v Muldoon and Others* 1976 2 NZLR 615 in which Wild CJ of the New Zealand Supreme Court confirmed that the Bill of Rights 1688 applies in New Zealand as received English law; and by *Mangawaro Enterprises Ltd v Attorney-General* 1994 2 NZLR 451 which confirmed the reception of English common

law into New Zealand; Common law rights exist in New Zealand independent of any statute;

5.2 THE RIGHT TO CHALLENGE JURISDICTION

At common law every living man or woman has the absolute right to challenge the jurisdiction of any court or tribunal before submitting to its authority; This is not a fringe argument; This is a fundamental principle of the common law confirmed by centuries of judicial decisions;

The right to challenge jurisdiction is confirmed in New Zealand by; Section 27 of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990; Every person has the right to the observance of the principles of natural justice by any tribunal or other public authority which has the power to make a determination in respect of that person's rights; obligations; or interests;

The right to natural justice includes the right to know the basis on which authority is claimed; A court or agency that cannot identify the source of its jurisdiction over a living man or woman cannot lawfully exercise that jurisdiction;

5.3 THE RIGHT TO REQUIRE IDENTIFICATION OF A LIVING INJURED PARTY

At common law no action lies without a wrong; No action lies without damage; No damage lies without a living injured party; These are the foundational maxims of the common law;

Ubi jus ibi remedium; Where there is a right there is a remedy;
Injuria sine damno; A legal wrong without damage gives no cause of action;
Damnum sine injuria; Damage without a legal wrong give no cause of action;

A prosecution brought by a registered commercial entity that cannot identify a living injured party who has suffered measurable damage is not a common law action; It is a commercial action; It is a regulatory revenue generating activity conducted in the name of the law but without the foundational requirement of the law; a living injured party;

When MPI prosecutes a living man or woman for a fisheries offence and cannot identify a single living person who suffered measurable damage from that conduct it is not enforcing the common law; It is enforcing a commercial regulatory framework for the benefit of the commercial system from which it operates;

PART SIX; CONCLUSION AND REMEDY

6.1 THE SUMMARY OF FACTS

The following facts are established and confirmed from primary sources;

ONE; The word person in law means a legal fiction; an artificial entity; a creature of the

law; It does not mean a living man or woman; This is confirmed by Black's Law Dictionary Second and Fourth Editions and by section 29 of the Interpretation Act 1999;

TWO; Surnames were imposed by governments for the purpose of taxation and administrative control; They are not a natural human universal; They are a tool of capture; This is confirmed by primary legislative sources including the Statute of Kilkenny 1367; the Laws in Wales Acts 1535 and 1542; the French Imperial Decree of 1811; the Turkish Surname Law of 1934 and the Births Deaths Marriages and Relationships Registration Act 1995 of New Zealand;

THREE; Birth registration creates a legal fiction separate and distinct from the living man or woman; The living man or woman and the legal fiction are two separate entities; This is confirmed by *Salomon v A Salomon and Co Ltd* 1897 UKHL 1; the foundational corporate law decision of the common law world;

FOUR; The term sovereign citizen has no legal definition in New Zealand; It appears in no statute; no regulation; no binding case law; It is a label imported from the United States through academic papers and media reporting; It is used by government agencies; their lawyers and their officers to dismiss legitimate legal arguments without examination defaming your character and to cause harm both emotionally and financially;

FIVE; THE SOVEREIGN IN RIGHT OF NEW ZEALAND is a registered entity on the London Stock Exchange LEI register; LEI 549300237GPHG2AI7C34; THE SOVEREIGN IN RIGHT OF NEW ZEALAND ACTING BY AND THROUGH THE SECRETARY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND TRADE is registered on the United Kingdom Companies House register under Company Number OE020656; These are registered commercial fictions; They are not sovereign in the true meaning of the word;

SIX; MPI; Crown Law and every other government agency that enforces against living men and women is itself a registered commercial entity; MPI holds Company Number 300001091; NZBN 9429000096157 and GST Number 64-558-838; Crown Law holds Company Number 300000307; These entities are creatures of the law; They are the artificial persons; They are the legal fictions; **They are the sovereign citizens in the precise legal meaning of those words;**

SEVEN; The living man or woman who challenges the authority of these registered entities is not a sovereign citizen; They are asserting their common law rights; rights that exist independent of any statute; rights confirmed by Magna Carta 1215; by the English Laws Act 1858; by the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 and by centuries of common law jurisprudence;

6.2 THE REMEDY

The remedy available to the living man or woman is not revolution; It is not violence; It is not the rejection of all law; It is the precise; documented and lawful assertion of the distinction between the legal fiction and the living man or woman; It is the demand that

every entity claiming authority identify;

ONE; The living injured party;

TWO; The damage sustained by that living injured party;

THREE; The remedy sought that is proportionate to that damage;

FOUR; The specific legislative provision that grants jurisdiction over the living man or woman as distinct from the legal fiction;

FIVE; The instrument of consent by which the living man or woman agreed to be subject to that jurisdiction;

If these five things cannot be identified the jurisdiction cannot be established; The action cannot proceed; The label sovereign citizen cannot substitute for this analysis; The label is not law; The law is law

6.3 THE FINAL STATEMENT

Richard-Owen is a living man; He is not a legal fiction; He is not a registered entity; He is not a creature of the law; He was born on 3 October 1966 at St Helens Public Hospital in Christchurch; He has breath; blood; consciousness and life; He exists independent of any statute; any register; any company number; any NZBN; any GST number and any LEI number;

The legal fiction Richard Owen Powell was registered on 7 October 1966; It is a creature of the law; It exists on paper only; It has no breath; no blood; no consciousness; no life; It is the entity that is taxed; regulated; enrolled; assigned numbers and subjected to the statutory system;

These two entities are not the same; Salomon v A Salomon and Co Ltd 1897 UKHL 1 confirms they are not the same; The New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 section 29 confirms they are not the same; The law itself confirms they are not the same;

The Richard-Owen asserts his common law rights; He asserts the distinction between himself and the legal fiction created in his name; He asserts the right to require any entity claiming authority over him to identify its jurisdiction; its injured party; its damage and its consent; He does so not as a sovereign citizen; but as a living man standing on the law; standing on the common law; standing on the rights that no statute can remove and no label can extinguish;

**Crown-Richard-Owen; house of Powell-Webley
All Rights Reserved; Without Prejudice;**

APPENDIX ONE; CONFIRMED ENTITY REFERENCE TABLE

The following entities are confirmed from primary sources as registered commercial entities exercising authority over living men and women in New Zealand;

ENTITY ONE

Name; THE SOVEREIGN IN RIGHT OF NEW ZEALAND
Also Known As; HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF NEW ZEALAND
LEI Number; 549300237GPHG2AI7C34
Registered At; C/O THE TREASURY; PO Box 3724; Wellington 6140
Entity Category; RESIDENT GOVERNMENT ENTITY
Status; ACTIVE
Source; lei.report; London Stock Exchange LEI Limited

ENTITY TWO

Name; THE SOVEREIGN IN RIGHT OF NEW ZEALAND ACTING BY AND THROUGH THE SECRETARY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND TRADE
UK Companies House Number; OE020656
Registered; 31 January 2023
Address; Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade; 195 Lambton Quay; Wellington 6011
Source; UK Companies House

ENTITY THREE

Name; MINISTRY FOR PRIMARY INDUSTRIES
NZ Company Number; 300001091
NZBN; 9429000096157
GST Number; 64-558-838
Westpac Bank Account; 03-0049-0001709-002
Source; NZ Companies Register; MPI official website

ENTITY FOUR

Name; CROWN LAW OFFICE
NZ Company Number; 300000307
NZBN; 9429041904718
Source; NZ Companies Register

ENTITY FIVE

Name; NEW ZEALAND POLICE
NZ Company Number; 300001205
NZBN; 9429041909966
GST Number; 14-290-451
D-U-N-S Number; 590216123
Westpac Bank Account; 03-0049-0000802-27
Incorporated; 14 June 2017
Registered Office; 180 Molesworth Street; Wellington 6140
Source; NZ Companies Register; fyi.org.nz OIA responses IR-01-22-29820 and IR-01-24-5821