

THE OWEN REPORT

MANAGED WITHOUT INFORMED CONSENT

A FACTUAL INVESTIGATION INTO THE CORPORATISATION OF NEW ZEALAND GOVERNMENT FROM HE WHAKAPUTANGA 1835 TO THE PRESENT DAY; DOCUMENTED FROM PRIMARY SOURCES

BCIM 107

New Zealand Birth Certificate
Te Tohu Whānautanga ki Aotearoa

First given name(s) Ihara kōwhiri	Richard Owen	Child / Tamaiti
Surname/family name Ihara kōwhiri	Powell	
First given name(s) at birth* Ihara kōwhiri (to whānautanga mai)	-	
Surname/family name at birth* Ihara kōwhiri (to whānautanga mai)	-	
Sex Māori: Māori Pākehā: Pākehā	Male	
Birth order/Multiple birth (if applicable) --- especially for multiple births whānau mai (Ihara kōwhiri) (to whānautanga mai)	-	
Date of birth Te tau o te whānau	3 October 1986	
Place of birth Te whānau	St Helen's Public Hospital Christchurch	
New Zealand citizen by birth* He kōwhiri ki Aotearoa (to whānautanga mai)	Not applicable to births that occurred prior to 1 January 2006	
Parent's name(s) Ihara kōwhiri (to whānautanga mai)	-	

First given name(s) Ihara kōwhiri	Sally Winsome	Mother / Whaea
Surname/family name Ihara kōwhiri	Powell	
First given name(s) at birth* Ihara kōwhiri (to whānautanga mai)	-	
Surname/family name at birth* Ihara kōwhiri (to whānautanga mai)	Webb	
Age Ihara kōwhiri	29	
Place of birth Te whānau	Christchurch	

First given name(s) Ihara kōwhiri	Victor George	Father / Matua
Surname/family name Ihara kōwhiri	Powell	
First given name(s) at birth* Ihara kōwhiri (to whānautanga mai)	-	
Surname/family name at birth* Ihara kōwhiri (to whānautanga mai)	-	
Age Ihara kōwhiri	36	
Place of birth Te whānau	Manchester England	

* If name has changed / Māori has changed to Ihara kōwhiri
* As determined under the Citizenship Act 1977 / E ai ki te Kaitiaki Take Kōwhiri 1977
* If different from above / Māori has changed to Ihara kōwhiri

Certified to be a true copy of the above particulars included in an entry recorded in this office.
E kōwhiri ki Aotearoa (to whānautanga mai) (to whānautanga mai) (to whānautanga mai) (to whānautanga mai)

Issued under the seal of the Registrar on 28 March 2015.
He kōwhiri ki Aotearoa (to whānautanga mai) (to whānautanga mai) (to whānautanga mai) (to whānautanga mai)

1966109132

This certificate is not evidence of the identity of the living man or woman presenting it

* If name has changed / Mēnā kua rerekē te ingoa
 ** As determined under the Citizenship Act 1977 / E ai ki tā te Citizenship Act 1977 whakaritenga
 *** If different from above / Mēnā he rerekē ki tērā o runga ake

Registration Number / Te Tau ā-Motu

1966109132

Certified to be a true copy of the above particulars included in an entry recorded in this office.
 E pono ana te kī he tauira tūturu tēnei o ngā kōrero o runga ake nei kua tuhia ki tētahi puka i tēnei tari.

Issued under the seal of the Registrar on 19 July 2022
 I tukuna i raro i te maru o te Poutoki i te 19 Hōngongoi 2022

WARNING: This certificate is not evidence of the identity of the person presenting it.
 KIA TŪPATO: Ehara tā tēnei tiwhikete i te tauira i te tauira o te tangata ka tāpae atu

CAUTION: Any person who (1) falsifies any of the particulars on the certificate, or (2) uses it as true, knowing it to be false, is liable to prosecution under the Crimes Act 1961.
 WHAKAHIHI: Ko te tangata (1) ka whakarekē i ngā kōrero o tēnei tiwhikete, (2) ka whakamahi ānō nei he pono, me te mōhio and kai te hōri kē, ka taea te whakawhiu i raro i te Ture Takahi Ture 1961.



BDM 107 — REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS PRINTED — ISSUED BY THE CROWN OF NEW ZEALAND, 19 JULY 2022

The document above was issued by the Crown of New Zealand; The words printed upon it are the Crown's own; They are reproduced here exactly as they appear;

The reader is invited to consider what it means that the foundational document of every living man or woman born in New Zealand carries on its face the Crown's own disclaimer that it cannot be used to identify the person it was issued for;

This report exists to answer that question;

AUTHOR'S NOTE

This report was prepared by Crown-Richard, living man.

The research, analysis, and conclusions contained in this report are those of the author. Every claim made in this report is sourced from primary documents. Sources include official Crown publications, OIA responses, parliamentary records, departmental reports, legislation, and case law. All sources are cited. All are verifiable. No claim is made that is not supported by a cited primary source.

COPYRIGHT NOTICE

Crown-Richard, living man, hereby asserts and reserves all rights as the living author of this work pursuant to Section 94 of the Copyright Act 1994 New Zealand, being the right to be identified as author, and Section 95 of the Copyright Act 1994 New Zealand, being the content of the right to be identified, and the inherent moral rights of the living man as creator and originator of this work.

Copyright Crown-Richard, living man. New Zealand, 2026. All Rights Reserved. This copyright subsists for the life of the author and seventy years thereafter pursuant to Section 22 of the Copyright Act 1994 New Zealand.

PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION TERMS

This document is produced for public distribution and is protected in its entirety. It may not be reproduced, copied, shared, transmitted, published, uploaded, or distributed in whole or in part by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, digital, or photographic, without the prior express written consent of the author. Receipt of this document grants the recipient a single user, non-transferable, personal licence to read and reference this work for personal research purposes only. No licence is granted to reproduce, resell, repackage, or distribute this work in any form. Any unauthorised reproduction or distribution constitutes an infringement of the author's rights under the Copyright Act 1994 and at Common Law, and may result in civil and criminal proceedings.

LAWFUL NOTICE

Crown-Richard is a living man standing in natural law. His standing precedes every statute. It precedes every commercial registration. It precedes every Act of Parliament. This work is produced in his private capacity. No portion of this work shall be construed as constituting legal advice. This is lawful research and information prepared for educational and public interest purposes. This notice is served to all who receive this document.

New Zealand, 2026.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART ONE; THE SOVEREIGN FOUNDATION

Chapter One; He Whakaputanga 1835

Chapter Two; The Letters Patent 1839; A Void Instrument Under International Law

Chapter Three; The Treaty of Waitangi 1840; A Secondary Instrument

PART TWO; THE PROGRESSIVE REMOVAL OF SOVEREIGNTY

Chapter Four; The Constitution That Protected every Living Man and Woman; 1852

Chapter Five; The Abolition of the Upper House 1951

Chapter Six; The Constitution Act 1986; The Critical Break

PART THREE; THE CORPORATISED STATE; HOW IT OPERATES TODAY

Chapter Seven; Parliament as Theatre

Chapter Eight; The Crown; What It Actually Is

Chapter Nine; The Corporatisation of Government

Chapter Ten; The Ministry for Primary Industries; Case Study

PART FOUR; THE JUDICIARY; THE LEGAL PROFESSION; AND THE ENFORCEMENT CHAIN

Chapter Eleven; The Law Society and the Self Perpetuating System

Chapter Twelve; The Courts; Administrative Tribunals Performing as Courts of Justice

PART FIVE; THE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK; FROM BIRTH TO DEATH

Chapter Thirteen; The Registration and Identifier System

PART SIX; THE MONETARY FRAMEWORK

Chapter Fourteen; Money Creation and the Debt Framework

PART SEVEN; THE CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS STATED

Chapter Fifteen; Management Without Consent; A Summary of Nine Findings

Chapter Sixteen; What This System Actually Is; The Four Confirmed Elements

Chapter Seventeen; Conclusion; The Record Speaks for Itself

CLOSING STATEMENT; TO THE LIVING PEOPLE OF NEW ZEALAND

APPENDIX ONE; PRIMARY SOURCES AND REFERENCES

APPENDIX TWO; VERIFIED COMMERCIAL IDENTIFIERS OF KEY ENTITIES

APPENDIX THREE; KEY CONSTITUTIONAL INSTRUMENTS IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

APPENDIX FOUR; THE COMPANIENZ DISCREPANCY; DOCUMENTED

APPENDIX FIVE; THE PRIMARY SOURCE DOCUMENT; DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE REPORT JL186/41

APPENDIX SIX; THE ELECTORAL COMMISSION ADMISSIONS; DOCUMENTED

APPENDIX SEVEN; GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS

THE OWEN REPORT

MANAGED WITHOUT INFORMED CONSENT

A FACTUAL INVESTIGATION INTO THE CORPORATISATION OF NEW ZEALAND GOVERNMENT FROM HE WHAKAPUTANGA 1835 TO THE PRESENT DAY; DOCUMENTED FROM PRIMARY SOURCES

PREPARED BY Crown-Richard

PREFATORY NOTE

This report is a factual historical and legal investigation. Every claim is sourced from primary documents, parliamentary records, official government publications, verified commercial registrations, and public records. It does not rely on secondary commentary or unsourced assertion. It is prepared as a foundation document for use in legal proceedings, public discourse, and community education. It contains no political opinion. It contains facts. The facts speak for themselves.

A NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY

Throughout this report the entity commonly referred to as the Crown and operating under the name the Sovereign in Right of New Zealand is designated CROWN INC.

This designation is not rhetorical. It reflects the documented commercial status of that entity as confirmed by its own registrations on the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, the London Stock Exchange LEI framework, and UK Companies House.

CROWN INC. is a corporation. It is not a living authority. It is not a royal institution. It holds no sovereign standing in natural law. Sovereign standing belongs only to the living man and woman. It cannot be held by a fiction.

Every reference to the Crown in the modern context in this report means CROWN INC. unless expressly stated otherwise. Where the report addresses the colonial period prior to 1986 the Crown is referenced as the British Crown or the Colonial Crown to reflect its historical character before the transformation to a registered commercial entity documented in Chapter Eight.

WHY THIS REPORT IS AUTHORED BY CROWN-RICHARD

The designation Crown-Richard requires explanation. It is not a title assumed for effect. It is a precise and lawful statement of standing. It must be understood before anything else in this report is read.

Every officer who will encounter this report operates within a commercial framework. The Registrar. The Judge. The Prosecutor. Every one of them works for a company. That company works for CROWN INC. They are employees and officers of a commercial management framework. They are not sovereign authorities. They are not living crowns. They are administrators of a corporation.

When a living man or woman appears before that framework they are presumed to be one of three things. They are presumed to be the legal fiction. The NAME on the summons. The paper entity created at birth in their name. They are presumed to be a trustee. Administering the estate of that fiction. Holding the liability but never the benefit. And they are presumed to have consented. To the jurisdiction. To the proceeding. To the framework itself. Consent assumed by appearance. Consent assumed by answering to the name. Consent assumed by engaging without objection. That presumption is never stated aloud. It is never disclosed. It is simply assumed. And on that assumption the entire proceeding is built.

Crown-Richard is none of those things.

The word Crown in this designation does not refer to CROWN INC. It does not refer to any statutory construct. It does not refer to any commercial entity. It refers to the highest lawful standing available to a living man or woman on this earth. The Crown is the living man or woman's direct and unbroken connection to the natural order. To the living law that precedes every statute. To the sovereign nature inherent in every living being that no parliament has the authority to legislate away. It is not granted by any Parliament. It is not issued by any government. It is not registered on any commercial exchange. It is inherent. It is living. It is the sovereign nature of every living being standing in their natural state.

That standing is the highest jurisdiction that exists. It sits above every commercial tribunal. It sits above every statutory framework. It sits above every registered company including CROWN INC. and every ministry and agency that operates beneath it. No fiction can stand above the living. No corporation can outrank the living man or woman standing in their natural state under the living law that precedes all statute.

The Registrar works for a company. The Judge works for a company. The Prosecutor works for a company. Crown-Richard works for no company. Crown-Richard answers to no corporation. Crown-Richard stands in natural law as a living man in his natural state. That standing precedes every statute. It precedes every commercial registration. It precedes every Act of Parliament. It is not granted by any government. It cannot be removed by any government. It simply is.

This report is authored from that standing. Every finding in it is made from that standing. Every challenge to the commercial framework documented within it proceeds from that standing.

Crown-Richard.

Living man. Standing in his natural state. Under natural law

PART ONE; THE SOVEREIGN FOUNDATION

CHAPTER ONE; HE WHAKAPUTANGA O TE RANGATIRATANGA O NU TIRENI 1835

On 28 October 1835 thirty four Rangatira of the northern hapu of Nu Tirenī signed He Whakaputanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tirenī at Waitangi. The declaration stated that the sovereign power and authority of the land of New Zealand was held entirely by the hereditary chiefs. That they alone had the right to make laws for their people. That no foreign power would be permitted to make laws for this land without the consent of the Rangatira assembled in their congress.

The declaration was witnessed by the British Resident James Busby and forwarded to King William IV. The King acknowledged it by reply dated 2 March 1836. The British Crown formally and officially acknowledged the sovereign authority of the Rangatira of Nu Tirenī.

He Whakaputanga established three foundational facts.

First. The sovereign authority of this land resided in the hereditary chiefs of the hapu of Nu Tirenī.

Second. That authority was formally declared and internationally acknowledged by the British Crown itself.

Third. No law could be made for this land without the consent of the Rangatira.

He Whakaputanga has never been formally repealed. It remains on the constitutional record of this land. The sovereign authority it declared has never been lawfully extinguished.

Source. He Whakaputanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tirenī, 28 October 1835. Archives New Zealand reference IA 9/9. Reply of King William IV, 2 March 1836.

CHAPTER TWO; THE LETTERS PATENT 1839; A VOID INSTRUMENT UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW

On 15 June 1839 Letters Patent were issued in London purporting to expand the territory of New South Wales to include the entire territory of New Zealand. Captain William Hobson was appointed Lieutenant Governor over New Zealand under this instrument.

This was done seven and a half months before the Treaty of Waitangi was signed on 6 February 1840.

THE LETTERS PATENT ARE VOID UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW; THREE GROUNDS

The Letters Patent of 15 June 1839 are void and of no legal effect under the international law principles that were operative and recognised at the time of their issuance. This is

not a modern retrospective argument. It is grounded in the law of nations as it stood in 1839. The three grounds are as follows.

GROUND ONE; NEW ZEALAND WAS NOT TERRA NULLIUS

The foundational principle under which a sovereign power could claim territory by Letters Patent or similar executive instrument was the doctrine of terra nullius. Meaning land belonging to no one. Land that was uninhabited. Unclaimed. Without peoples holding established mana over it. Only such land could lawfully be claimed by occupation and executive instrument.

New Zealand did not meet that definition. It was a fully inhabited land. With peoples who had occupied every part of it for centuries. With a sophisticated system of tikanga. Customary law. Social organisation. And territorial authority that was well established and fully operative long before any European vessel appeared on its horizon.

Furthermore and decisively the sovereign authority of the Rangatira of this land had been formally declared in He Whakaputanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tireni on 28 October 1835. The Declaration of Independence of New Zealand. That declaration had been acknowledged by the British Crown itself through the reply of King William IV dated 2 March 1836. The British Crown therefore knew as a matter of its own formal record that New Zealand was not terra nullius. It had formally acknowledged the sovereign authority of the Rangatira four years before the Letters Patent were issued.

A sovereign power cannot claim as vacant land a territory whose sovereign authority it has already formally acknowledged. The Letters Patent of 15 June 1839 were issued in direct contradiction of the British Crown's own formal acknowledgement of 1836. They are void on this ground alone. Not voidable. Void. Issued in knowing contradiction of a prior formal acknowledgment. That is not an administrative error. That is a deliberate act. A deliberate misrepresentation of the status of this land inscribed into the Letters Patent themselves.

The South Island was not empty. It was not without peoples. It was not without established mana over its territories. The Rapuwai were among the earliest documented inhabitants of the island. Inhabiting it for centuries before the arrival of any later peoples. The Waitaha followed. A collection of ancient peoples whose occupation of the South Island is documented from approximately 1477. The Ngai Tahu Report 1991 of the Waitangi Tribunal records in its own words that older iwi still occupied the island before the southern migrations of Ngati Mamoe and Ngai Tahu. These people are collectively known as Waitaha. They recorded their long and eventful occupation of the island in its most ancient narratives. Ngati Mamoe arrived next. Interacting with Waitaha through conflict and intermarriage across generations. Ngai Tahu came later still. Migrating to the South Island in the 1700s and becoming the dominant iwi through intermarriage and adoption of existing peoples. They were not the first. They were the most recent of the major migrations before the British colonial proclamation. Ngati Toa held the northern reaches of the South Island in the Cloudy Bay area. Rangitane maintained presence in the northern reaches also.

The South Island in 1840 was therefore a land of layered and ancient occupation. With peoples whose relationship to their territories was defined by tikanga and whakapapa stretching back centuries. With established mana over every rohe. With complex social structures built across generations of living on and with the land.

When Hobson proclaimed British sovereignty over the South Island on 21 May 1840, he did so on the basis of discovery and occupation rather than cession. He knew the island was inhabited. He knew its peoples held established mana over their territories. He knew their relationship to the land predated any European presence by centuries. The terra nullius doctrine was not applied out of ignorance. It was applied as a deliberate legal fiction of convenience. Applied to claim territory that could not be claimed by cession because the peoples of the South Island had not consented to cede it. The Crown claimed a land was empty that it knew was not. That is not a legal argument. That is a documented lie. Inscribed into the proclamation of 21 May 1840. And it has never been honestly corrected.

Sources. Ngai Tahu Report 1991. Waitangi Tribunal. Section 3.1.3. Christchurch City Libraries Tribal History Records. Ngai Tahu iwi official website ngaitahu.iwi.nz. Hobson proclamation of sovereignty over the South Island 21 May 1840. Reverend James W Stack. Sketch of the Traditional History of the South Island Maoris. Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board. He Whakaputanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tireni 1835. Archives New Zealand. Reply of King William IV to the Rangatira of New Zealand 2 March 1836. Archives New Zealand.

GROUND TWO; THE LAW OF NATIONS; VATTTEL 1758

The governing text of international law at the time of the Letters Patent was Emer de Vattel's *The Law of Nations* published in 1758. This work was the most authoritative statement of the law of nations in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. It was relied upon by courts, governments, and diplomats throughout the period.

Vattel stated in *The Law of Nations* Book One Chapter Eighteen the following principle.

A nation has a right to everything that can procure it an evident good, and no other nation has a right to judge of the use it makes of this right.

More critically for the Letters Patent question Vattel stated in Book Two Chapter Seven.

When a nation takes possession of a distant country and settles a colony there that country though separated from the principal establishment forms part of the state equally with its ancient possessions.

The operative word is nation. Vattel's framework requires that the claiming entity be a nation with a legitimate basis for its claim. The Letters Patent purported to claim New Zealand as an extension of New South Wales. But New South Wales itself had no legitimate sovereign claim over New Zealand. It was a colonial administration of a distant imperial power, not a sovereign nation with a recognised territorial basis for

expansion into New Zealand.

Vattel further stated in Book One Chapter Seven that a sovereign authority derives its legitimacy from the consent and recognition of the people it governs. The Rangatira of New Zealand had not consented to governance by New South Wales. They had formally declared their own sovereign authority in 1835. Their declaration had been acknowledged by the Crown. No consent to New South Wales jurisdiction was ever given or sought.

GROUND THREE; THE DISTANCE PRINCIPLE; PRACTICAL SOVEREIGNTY

Under the law of nations as understood in 1839 a sovereign power could not exercise effective jurisdiction over a territory it could not practically govern. This principle derives from the fundamental requirement that sovereignty be real and effective, not merely claimed on paper.

New South Wales is approximately one thousand nautical miles from New Zealand. In 1839 this distance was traversed only by sailing ship. The journey took weeks. Communication between New South Wales and New Zealand was not regular, not reliable, and not rapid. The Governor of New South Wales had no practical capacity to govern New Zealand. He had limited knowledge of the people, no connection to the land, no understanding of the customs and governance structures of the Rangatira, and no practical accountability to the living people of this land.

A sovereign claim that cannot be practically exercised is not a sovereign claim. It is a paper assertion. Under the law of nations, a paper assertion of sovereignty over a distant inhabited territory whose sovereign authority has already been formally acknowledged is not a valid territorial claim.

The Letters Patent of 15 June 1839 purported to extend the jurisdiction of a colonial administration located one thousand nautical miles away over a fully inhabited and sovereignly governed land whose sovereign authority the issuing power had itself formally acknowledged four years earlier. Under every operative principle of the law of nations in 1839 this instrument was void.

THE SEQUENCE REVEALS THE FRAUD

The sequence of events surrounding the Letters Patent reveals the fraudulent nature of the Crown's constitutional claim.

15 June 1839. Letters Patent issued in London purporting to incorporate New Zealand into New South Wales. New Zealand is claimed as Crown territory by executive instrument.

6 February 1840. The Treaty of Waitangi is signed at Waitangi. The Crown presents the Treaty to the Rangatira as an agreement about governance.

The Treaty was presented to the Rangatira as if it were the foundational instrument of Crown authority. But the Crown had already claimed the territory seven and a half months earlier by Letters Patent. The Treaty was not the basis for Crown authority. It was a subsequent instrument presented after the jurisdictional claim had already been made.

The Rangatira were not told that the Crown had already claimed their land by executive instrument before the Treaty was signed. They were not told that the Letters Patent of 15 June 1839 had already purported to place their land within the jurisdiction of New South Wales. They signed the Treaty of Waitangi in the belief that they were entering into a genuine agreement about the sharing of governance. They were not told they were signing a document that the Crown would use to legitimise a territorial claim it had already made without their knowledge or consent.

This is not governance. It is not treaty making. It is the use of legal instruments to achieve by deception what could not be achieved by consent.

THE CONSEQUENCE

The Letters Patent of 15 June 1839 are void under the law of nations as it stood in 1839 on three independent grounds.

First. New Zealand was not terra nullius. It was an inhabited and sovereignly governed land whose sovereign authority the Crown had formally acknowledged in 1836.

Second. Under Vattel's Law of Nations 1758, the governing text of international law at the time, a sovereign claim over an inhabited territory whose sovereign authority has been formally acknowledged is not a valid territorial claim.

Third. New South Wales had no practical capacity to exercise effective sovereignty over a territory located one thousand nautical miles away. A paper claim of sovereignty over a distant inhabited land does not constitute effective sovereignty under the law of nations.

The constitutional claim of the Crown over New Zealand therefore rests on a void instrument. The Treaty of Waitangi was presented to the Rangatira after the void instrument had already been issued. The entire constitutional framework that follows, the 1852 Constitution, the 1986 Constitution Act, the management framework of commercially registered entities, traces its authority back to an instrument that was void at the moment of its issuance under the international law principles operative at the time.

A void foundation cannot support a legitimate structure. Everything built upon it is built upon nothing.

Source. Letters Patent 15 June 1839. Archives New Zealand. He Whakaputanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tirenī 1835. Archives New Zealand reference IA 9/9. Reply of King William IV 2 March 1836. Emer de Vattel. The Law of Nations, 1758. Book One Chapter Seven. Book One Chapter Eighteen. Book Two Chapter Seven. Waitangi Tribunal Te Paparahi o te Raki Stage One Report 2014. Wai 1040. Terra nullius doctrine, international law of nations 1839.

The Letters Patent claimed sovereignty before the Treaty was signed. The Treaty itself exists in two texts that say fundamentally different things about what the Rangatira agreed to. Chapter Three documents both texts and what the Crown's own statutory tribunal found about what was and was not ceded.

CHAPTER THREE; THE TREATY OF WAITANGI 1840; A SECONDARY INSTRUMENT

On 6 February 1840 the Treaty of Waitangi was signed at Waitangi. It was signed seven and a half months after the Letters Patent of 15 June 1839 had already purported to claim this land as Crown territory. The Treaty was therefore not the foundational instrument of Crown authority. The Crown had already claimed authority before the Treaty was signed. The Treaty was presented to the Rangatira after the jurisdictional claim had already been made without their knowledge or consent.

The Treaty exists in two materially different texts. The Maori text ceded kawanatanga, governance, to the Crown while retaining tino rangatiratanga, full chieftainship, over their lands and people. The English text used the word sovereignty. These are fundamentally different concepts. The Waitangi Tribunal in its Te Paparahi o te Raki inquiry Stage One Report 2014 Wai 1040 found that the Rangatira did not cede sovereignty. They agreed to share governance while retaining their authority over their people and lands.

The Treaty therefore did not and could not establish the sovereign authority it was presented as establishing. The Crown had already claimed that authority by Letters Patent before the Treaty was signed. The Treaty was a subsequent instrument presented to the Rangatira without disclosure of what had already been done.

What followed the Treaty is more important than the Treaty itself. Twelve years later in 1852 the Imperial Parliament at Westminster enacted the New Zealand Constitution Act. That Act applied to every living man and woman on this land. Not to Maori only. Not to settlers only. To every living man and woman standing on this land. It established six provinces each with their own elected councils their own courts their own laws their own revenue. It required all law to be consistent with the law of England which included Magna Carta 1297 the Petition of Right 1628 and the Bill of Rights 1688. It protected the most fundamental rights of the living men and women of this land above every Parliament. It balanced power between the Governor representing the Sovereign the Legislative Council and the House of Representatives so that no single element could dominate.

That constitution is documented in Chapter Four. It is the instrument that protected every living man and woman on this land. It is the instrument that was progressively dismantled without the consent of the living men and women of this land. And it is the instrument that has been deliberately removed from public memory.

Source. Treaty of Waitangi 1840. Archives New Zealand. Waitangi Tribunal Te Paparahi o te Raki Stage One Report 2014. Wai 1040. New Zealand Constitution Act 1852. Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975. Letters Patent 15 June 1839.

PART TWO; THE PROGRESSIVE REMOVAL OF SOVEREIGNTY

CHAPTER FOUR; THE CONSTITUTION THAT PROTECTED EVERY LIVING MAN AND WOMAN; 1852

In 1852 the Imperial Parliament at Westminster enacted the New Zealand Constitution Act. It was the supreme law of this land. It was designed with one purpose. To protect every living man and woman on this land from the unlimited power of any government.

It was not designed for Maori only. It was not designed for settlers only. It was designed for every living man and woman standing on this land. That is the most important fact about it. And it is the fact that has been most completely erased from public memory.

THE PROVINCIAL STRUCTURE

The 1852 constitution established six provinces. Auckland. New Plymouth. Wellington. Nelson. Canterbury. Otago. Each province had its own elected Superintendent. Its own Provincial Council. Its own courts. Its own laws. Its own revenue. Its own police function. Its own schools. The living men and women of each province governed themselves through their own elected representatives on matters affecting their own province.

Central government was deliberately limited. The General Assembly at Wellington coordinated matters of national concern. The provinces governed everything else. Power flowed outward from the living men and women to their provincial councils. Not downward from Wellington to the living men and women of this land. That was the design. Provincial self-determination. Local sovereignty. Living men and women governing themselves.

Section XVIII of the 1852 Act confirmed the Superintendent of each Province with the advice and consent of the Provincial Council could make and ordain all such laws and ordinances as may be required for the peace order and good government of such Province. That was the power of the living men and women expressed through their own elected provincial councils. Real power. Local power. Sovereign power.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL BALANCE

The 1852 constitution balanced power between three separate constitutional elements. The Governor representing the Sovereign. The Legislative Council as the appointed upper house. The House of Representatives as the elected lower house.

No single element could dominate. The Governor could withhold assent from any legislation. The Legislative Council could reject legislation from the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives could not act alone. Three separate elements. Each checking the others. The Sovereign holding the supreme position. The Sovereign holding the Crown in trust for the living men and women of this land.

That balance meant no Parliament could simply pass any law it chose. Every law had to pass through three constitutional elements. Every law had to be consistent with the law of England. The living men and women of this land were protected above every Parliament by design.

THE ANCIENT RIGHTS ENTRENCHED

The requirement that all New Zealand law be consistent with the law of England was not an incidental provision. It was the foundational protection of every living man and woman on this land. The law of England at 1852 included Magna Carta 1297 25 Edward I Chapter 29. The Petition of Right 1628. The Bill of Rights 1688. Every ancient instrument of right that had been won by the living men and women of England over six hundred years of constitutional struggle.

Those ancient rights were entrenched above every Parliament by the 1852 constitution. No Parliament could pass a law that violated them. No court could uphold a law that was repugnant to them. They were the ceiling above which no government could reach.

No free man shall be taken or imprisoned or disseised of his freehold or liberties or free customs or be outlawed or exiled or any otherwise destroyed nor will we not pass upon him nor condemn him but by lawful judgment of his peers or by the law of the land. We will sell to no man we will not deny or defer to any man either justice or right.

Magna Carta 1297. Chapter 29. The law of New Zealand from 1852. Confirmed by Parliament's own hand in 1988 under the Imperial Laws Application Act. Standing today. Above every statute. Above every court. Above every commercial entity registered on the New Zealand Companies Register.

THE LIVING MEN AND WOMEN NEVER ASKED

In 1876 the provinces were abolished by the Abolition of Provinces Act. The living men and women of each province lost their self-governing councils their own courts their own laws. Power moved to Wellington. The living men and women of this land were not asked.

In 1950 the Legislative Council was abolished. The upper house that checked the power of the elected Parliament gone. Parliament became unicameral. One chamber. No check above it. The living men and women of this land were not asked.

In 1986 the Constitution Act replaced the entire 1852 Imperial framework with a simple Act of Parliament. The requirement that all law be consistent with the ancient rights of the English common law was gone. The constitutional balance between the Sovereign the upper house and the elected Parliament was gone. Parliament gave itself absolute power over its own constitutional arrangements. The living men and women of this land were not asked at any stage.

No referendum was ever held. Not once. Not on the abolition of the provinces. Not on the abolition of the upper house. Not on the replacement of the 1852 Imperial framework with the 1986 Act. The living men and women of this land were never asked whether they consented to any of these removals.

THE COPIES COLLECTED

Every copy of the 1852 constitution that had been displayed in public buildings in New Zealand was removed after 1986. The living men and women of New Zealand were never told why. They were never told that the constitutional foundation designed to protect every one of them from unlimited government power had been quietly replaced with a Parliament that now held unlimited power over every aspect of their lives.

THE TREATY ELEVATED AS THE CONSTITUTION WAS REMOVED

The Treaty of Waitangi was elevated in public discourse as the primary constitutional narrative of New Zealand at precisely the same time the 1852 constitutional protections were being removed. The Treaty divides the living men and women of this land into racial categories. The 1852 constitution protected every living man and woman on this land equally under one constitutional framework regardless of race regardless of iwi regardless of any other distinction.

The substitution of the Treaty for the 1852 constitution as the primary constitutional narrative of New Zealand is the most consequential and least examined constitutional event in the history of this nation. The instrument that protected every living man and woman was removed from public memory. The instrument that divides the living men and women of this land into racial categories was elevated in its place. The living men and women of this land were never told this had been done. They were never told what had been taken from them.

The 1852 constitution is not history. It is the foundation that was never lawfully surrendered by the living men and women of New Zealand. It was taken from them without their consent. And it is time they knew.

Source. New Zealand Constitution Act 1852. 15 and 16 Victoriae Cap 72. Imperial Parliament Westminster. Sections II XVIII XIX XXXII XXXIV XLVI LIII LIV. Abolition of Provinces Act 1876. Legislative Council Abolition Act 1950. Constitution Act 1986. Imperial Laws Application Act 1988 Section 3(1) and Schedule 1. Magna Carta 1297 25 Edward I Chapter 29. Petition of Right 1628. Bill of Rights 1688.

What was built in Chapter Four did not survive intact. The New Zealand Constitution Act 1852 was the supreme law of this land. It protected every living man and woman through provincial self-determination, constitutional balance, and the entrenchment of ancient rights above every Parliament. But the instrument that established those protections also contained within it the mechanism by which they could be dismantled. The General Assembly given authority to legislate for the peace order and good government of New Zealand used that authority not to protect the living men and women of this land but to progressively strip away the very protections the 1852 constitution had established. What follows is how that was done. Step by step. Decade by decade. Without the knowledge or consent of the living men and women whose rights were being removed.

CHAPTER FIVE; THE ABOLITION OF THE UPPER HOUSE 1951

The New Zealand Parliament until 1951 comprised two chambers. The House of Representatives and the Legislative Council. The Legislative Council was the upper house providing a constitutional check on the power of the lower house. It reviewed legislation and provided structural balance between the chambers.

In 1950 Prime Minister Sidney Holland appointed twenty-five new members to the Legislative Council. These appointees became known as the Suicide Squad. Their sole and explicit purpose was to vote the upper house out of existence. This is confirmed by Kumarasingham H in the Australasian Parliamentary Review of November 2010. The Legislative Council voted for its own abolition and ceased to exist on 1 January 1951.

No referendum was held. The living people were not asked whether they wished to remove the constitutional check that the upper house provided. New Zealand became one of the very few Westminster democracies in the world with a unicameral parliament. A single chamber with no constitutional check on its power other than a general election every three years.

This was the structural preparation for what followed in 1986. A single chamber parliament with unlimited power and no constitutional check was the instrument through which the Constitution Act 1986 was passed.

Source. Legislative Council Abolition Act 1950. Kumarasingham H. Australasian Parliamentary Review. November 2010.

With the upper house abolished and a single chamber parliament in place the constitutional framework was ready for the critical break of 1986. Chapter Six documents what the Crown's own Department of Justice recommended, what

Parliament enacted, and what was removed from the constitutional text without a referendum and without the knowledge or consent of the living people of this land.

CHAPTER SIX; THE CONSTITUTION ACT 1986; THE CRITICAL BREAK

The Constitution Act 1986 did not arrive without history. It was the final step in a process that had begun one hundred and ten years earlier with the abolition of the provinces in 1876. The 1852 constitution had established three protections that stood between the living men and women of this land and unlimited government power. Provincial self-determination giving real authority to the living men and women of each province. Constitutional balance between three separate elements ensuring no single element could dominate. And the requirement that all law be consistent with the law of England entrenching Magna Carta 1297, the Petition of Right 1628, and the Bill of Rights 1688 above every Parliament. By 1986 the first two protections had already been removed. The provinces gone since 1876. The upper house gone since 1950. The Constitution Act 1986 removed the third and final protection. The requirement of consistency with the law of England was gone. Parliament was now supreme over everything including the ancient rights of the living men and women of this land. The supreme law of this land. One hundred and thirty-four years. Gone in a single parliamentary session. No referendum. No consent. The living men and women of this land were never told.

The Constitution Act 1986 is the centrepiece of New Zealand's constitutional crisis. It is presented officially as a consolidation of existing constitutional arrangements. The reality is documented in the Crown's own official records.

On 14 July 1986 the Department of Justice submitted its official report to the Justice and Law Reform Committee of the New Zealand Parliament on the Constitution Bill. Reference JL186/41. Signed by the Secretary for Justice. This is an official Crown document on Department of Justice letterhead available on the New Zealand parliamentary record. It is reproduced in full as Appendix Five of this report.

That document reveals four deliberate decisions in the Crown's own words.

FIRST; THE TREATY DELIBERATELY EXCLUDED

The Department of Justice stated. Incorporating the Treaty of Waitangi or the bill of rights in this Bill would radically alter its nature. The Department recommended against inclusion. That recommendation was accepted. The founding document of this nation, the instrument through which the Crown itself claims authority over this land, was deliberately excluded from the constitutional act that defines the framework of governance.

SECOND; SECTION 71 PROTECTION DELIBERATELY REMOVED

Section 71 of the 1852 Act had protected Maori law and custom as a valid legal framework alongside English law since 1852. The Officials Committee recommended

not re-enacting it. The Department of Justice supported this recommendation. Section 71 was not carried forward. The Constitution Act 1986 therefore simultaneously excluded the Treaty and removed the only statutory protection of Maori law and custom that had existed since 1852.

THIRD; THE CONSTITUTION DELIBERATELY NOT ENTRENCHED

The Officials Committee stated in its own report quoted in the Department of Justice document. Our order of reference relates to the bringing together and updating of constitutional provisions rather than the preparation of a constitution that would have the character of superior law. To propose entrenchment could well be seen as giving that character. The Constitution Act 1986 was deliberately designed not to be superior law. It was deliberately designed to be amendable by simple parliamentary majority.

FOURTH; PARLIAMENTARY SOVEREIGNTY CONFIRMED UNLIMITED

The Department of Justice confirmed that the Parliament of New Zealand continues to have full power to make laws. No limits on that power were proposed. None were included.

No referendum was held. The living people of this land were not asked to approve the constitutional framework under which they would be governed.

These were not oversights. They were deliberate decisions documented in official Crown records signed by the Crown's own Secretary for Justice. The Treaty was excluded. Maori law was unprotected. Parliamentary power was made unlimited. The living people were not consulted.

Source. Department of Justice Report to the Justice and Law Reform Committee. Constitution Bill, 14 July 1986. Reference JL186/41. Signed by the Secretary for Justice. Pages 2, 3, 7, 10, and 11. Quoting Officials Committee Report paragraph 6.6 page 57.

With unlimited parliamentary power confirmed and no constitutional check remaining the stage was set for what followed. A parliament that can make any law it chooses without Treaty obligation, without superior law, and without the consent of the living people can do precisely what the following chapters document it did. Chapter Seven examines what that parliament actually is and how it actually operates behind the performance of democratic governance.

THE LAWS THEY CONFIRMED BUT NEVER TOLD YOU ABOUT

In 1988 the New Zealand Parliament passed the Imperial Laws Application Act. That Act confirmed which English laws remained in force in New Zealand. Not repealed. Not replaced. Not forgotten. Confirmed. Active. Operative.

Among those confirmed laws were Magna Carta 1297, the Petition of Right 1628, and the Bill of Rights 1688.

Magna Carta 1297 Chapter 29 states that no free man shall be taken or imprisoned or disseised of his freehold or liberties or free customs or be outlawed or exiled or any other wise destroyed, nor will we not pass upon him nor condemn him but by lawful judgment of his peers or by the law of the land. Source. Magna Carta 1297. Chapter 29. Confirmed operative in New Zealand by the Imperial Laws Application Act 1988.

The Petition of Right 1628 confirmed that no man should be compelled to make or yield any gift loan benevolence tax or such like charge without common consent by Act of Parliament. Source. Petition of Right 1628. Confirmed operative in New Zealand by the Imperial Laws Application Act 1988.

The Bill of Rights 1688 confirmed that excessive bail ought not to be required nor excessive fines imposed nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted. Source. Bill of Rights 1688. Confirmed operative in New Zealand by the Imperial Laws Application Act 1988.

Parliament reviewed every inherited English law in 1988 and had a clear choice. Repeal them or confirm them. Parliament confirmed them. Every one of these protections exists for the living man and woman in New Zealand today. Not because of theory or argument but because Parliament said so in 1988. The corporate structure documented in this report operates as though these protections do not exist. They do exist. They are confirmed by Parliament's own hand. The Imperial Laws Application Act 1988 is available at legislation.govt.nz. The Schedule to that Act lists every confirmed law. That list includes your protections.

PART THREE; THE CORPORATISED STATE; HOW IT OPERATES TODAY

CHAPTER SEVEN; PARLIAMENT AS THEATRE

Parliament sits as the visible face of governance. Every three years the living people of New Zealand are invited to vote. The cycle repeats. Governments change. Policies shift. The management framework remains.

The three year electoral cycle gives the living people the experience of participation while ensuring that no government has sufficient time or mandate to fundamentally alter the management framework beneath the theatre. Consider what does not change regardless of which party holds power.

The Reserve Bank continues to operate.

The IRD continues to collect.

The courts continue to process.

The Police continue to enforce.

The commercial registrations of government entities remain in place.

The bonds issued on international capital markets continue to be serviced from the productive labour of the living people.

Parliament debates. Parliament passes laws. Parliament changes the faces at the dispatch box every three years. The management framework is untouched. This is not democracy. It is the performance of democracy over a management framework that operates regardless of the performance. Nothing truly changes and further wealth is extracted from the individual through legislative creativity.

Source. Constitution Act 1986. State Owned Enterprises Act 1986. Crown Entities Act 2004. New Zealand Business Number Act 2016. Electoral Act 1993.

The management framework that operates beneath the theatre of parliament is not an abstraction. It is a commercially registered structure with documented identifiers on international financial registries. Chapter Eight documents precisely what the Crown is, not what it presents itself as, but what its own registrations confirm it to be.

CHAPTER EIGHT; THE CROWN; WHAT IT ACTUALLY IS

THE QUESTION EVERY NZ LIVING MAN AND WOMAN MUST ASK

When a New Zealand Police officer stops a living man or woman on the road, when MPI investigators raid a property, when the IRD issues a demand, when a court issues a judgment, when Parliament passes a law, one question must be asked.

On whose authority. And in whose interest.

The answer is documented from the Crown's own records. It is not what the living people of this land have been told.

WHAT NEW ZEALAND ACTUALLY IS

New Zealand presents itself to the world and to its own people as a sovereign democratic nation, a country governed by the will of its people through freely elected representatives, operating under the rule of law, accountable to its citizens.

The primary source evidence documented in this report establishes a different reality.

New Zealand is a corporatised management system operating under the form of democratic governance while functioning in substance as a commercial enterprise. It is not a sovereign democratic nation in the true meaning of those words. It is a technocratic corporate framework that performs the theatre of democracy while administering the living people as a managed population whose productive labour, compliance, and legal fictions provide the revenue, the collateral, and the mandate for the system that governs them.

This is not an opinion. It is the conclusion that follows inescapably from the primary source evidence documented in this report.

THE DPMC ADMISSION

The Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet states in its own official published description.

The Crown in Right of New Zealand is the legal personality of the New Zealand state encompassing the entire executive, legislative, and judicial machinery of government including the Sovereign. Ministers of the Crown, government departments, and the courts.

Legal personality is the creation of a legal fiction, an entity that exists in law but not in nature. The Crown admits in its own official communications that it is a legal fiction. Not a living sovereign accountable to the living people. A legal construct that exists only because lawyers say it exists.

This legal fiction governs the living people of New Zealand. The living people did not create it. They did not consent to it. They cannot hold it accountable in any meaningful sense. It has no face, no body, no conscience, and no accountability to the living men and women it governs.

THE CROWN AND THE SOVEREIGN; ONE ENTITY; TWO EXPRESSIONS

The Crown in Right of New Zealand is the constitutional expression of the entity. It encompasses the entire machinery of government as described by DPMC.

The Sovereign in Right of New Zealand is the same entity as it appears on international financial registers. It holds a Legal Entity Identifier issued by the London Stock Exchange LEI Limited. It was previously registered with the United States Securities and Exchange Commission.

They are not two different entities. They are the same legal fiction operating in two different contexts. The constitutional expression governs the living people through parliament, courts, and enforcement agencies. The financial expression participates in international capital markets issuing bonds serviced from the productive labour of those same living people.

THE CONFIRMED INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL REGISTRATIONS

The entity that governs the living people of New Zealand holds the following confirmed international financial registrations.

REGISTRATION ONE; UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Former Name. Her Majesty the Queen in Right of New Zealand.

Registered With SEC until 2013. SEC CIK, 0000216105.

SIC Code, 8888. Foreign Governments.

Bonds. USD 150 million registered on the New York Stock Exchange.

Signed by. New Zealand Debt Management Office, a unit of the New Zealand Treasury.
Source. SEC EDGAR database, sec.gov. Treasury OIA OIA-20240751.

REGISTRATION TWO; LONDON STOCK EXCHANGE LEI LIMITED

Current name. The Sovereign in Right of New Zealand.
Former name recorded. Her Majesty the Queen in Right of New Zealand.
LEI Number, 549300237GPHG2AI7C34.
Issuing authority. London Stock Exchange LEI Limited.
Assigned, 21 February 2013.
Status. ACTIVE.
Last updated, 16 December 2024.
Registered address. C/O The Treasury, PO Box 3724. Wellington 6140. New Zealand.
Source, openleis.com. Global Legal Entity Identifier Foundation. GLEIF.

REGISTRATION THREE; UK COMPANIES HOUSE

Name. The Sovereign in Right of New Zealand Acting By and Through the Secretary of Foreign Affairs and Trade.
UK Companies House Number. OE020656.
Status. Active overseas entity.
Source, find-and-update.company-information.service.gov.uk. OE020656.

THE TREASURY CONTRADICTION

The New Zealand Treasury in its OIA response OIA-20240751 stated:

Her Majesty the Queen in Right of New Zealand does not refer to a corporation registered in the United States.

That statement is technically narrow. It is also deliberately incomplete. And in its incompleteness, it is designed to mislead.

Here is what the Crown's own records show.

From at least 1988 through to approximately 2013 the New Zealand Treasury through its own New Zealand Debt Management Office filed annual 18-K reports with the United States Securities and Exchange Commission in the name Her Majesty the Queen in Right of New Zealand. CIK number 0000216105. SIC code 8888. Foreign Governments. USD 150 million bonds were registered on the New York Stock Exchange in that name. Treasury officers signed every filing personally.

Then in 2013 the entity migrated. A Legal Entity Identifier was issued by London Stock Exchange LEI Limited. LEI number 549300237GPHG2AI7C34. The entity name recorded: The Sovereign in Right of New Zealand. Also known as: Her Majesty the Queen in Right of New Zealand. Status: ACTIVE. Registered address: C/O The Treasury, PO Box 3724, Wellington. Then in January 2023 the same entity registered again as an

overseas entity on UK Companies House. Kinnaird House, 1 Pall Mall East, London.

The Treasury's OIA response was correct in one narrow sense. At the time the question was asked the entity was no longer registered in the United States. It had moved. From the SEC to the London Stock Exchange. From one international financial exchange to another. It has never stopped being a commercially registered entity operating on international financial markets. It simply changed address.

When a living person asked a lawful question about the nature of the entity that governs them the Treasury answered with the one narrow technical truth that concealed the complete picture. It did not say the entity had previously been registered in the United States for decades. It did not say the entity currently holds an active LEI on the London Stock Exchange. It did not say the entity registered on UK Companies House in 2023. It said only that it is not registered in the United States. Right now. In this moment.

That is not an error. That is not administrative confusion. That is a deliberate and calculated concealment through selective disclosure. Confirmed from the Crown's own records. Signed by the Crown's own officers. Filed with foreign financial regulators by the Crown's own Debt Management Office.

The entity that passes your laws, operates your courts, commands your Police, and administers your taxes has been continuously registered as a commercial entity on international financial markets from at least 1988 to this day. And when asked directly it told you only what it needed to tell you to make you stop asking.

That is the contradiction. And it is documented entirely from the Crown's own records.

THE POWERS OF THE LEGAL FICTION

This legal fiction holds the following confirmed powers over the living people under New Zealand statute.

The power to pass any law without limit. Constitution Act 1986.

The power to tax the productive labour of the living people. Income Tax Act 2007.

The power to compel electoral enrolment without consent. Electoral Act 1993 Section 82.

The power to seize property. Local Government Act 2002.

The power to remove children from families. Oranga Tamariki Act 1989.

The power to detain the living people. Corrections Act 2004.

The power to control movement across borders. Immigration Act 2009.

The power to control the use of land. Resource Management Act 1991.

The power to control what is grown, sold, and traded. Primary Industries legislation.

No court can strike down the legislation through which these powers are exercised. No constitutional instrument limits them. The Treaty of Waitangi has no supreme law status. Parliament confirmed its own unlimited power in the Constitution Act 1986 on

the recommendation of its own Department of Justice as documented in Chapter Six.

WHAT THIS MEANS IN PLAIN LANGUAGE

The entity that passes the laws, operates the courts, commands the Police, administers the IRD, and manages the living people of New Zealand from birth to death is the same entity that issues bonds on international capital markets, holds an active registration on the London Stock Exchange, and was previously registered with the SEC in the United States.

This means the following with precision.

The living people of New Zealand are not citizens of a sovereign democratic nation. They are the managed population of a corporatised state whose governing entity participates in international capital markets.

Their productive labour services the bonds issued by that entity on those markets.

Their taxes fund the operations of that entity and its commercially registered subdivisions.

Their compliance generates revenue for the enforcement agencies of that entity.

Their legal fictions provide the democratic mandate that legitimises the entire structure.

Their courts, their Police, their parliament, their IRD are all subdivisions of an entity registered on the London Stock Exchange.

THE PRECISE DESCRIPTION

New Zealand is not a sovereign democratic nation.

It is a corporatised technocratic state that performs the theatre of democratic governance while operating in substance as a commercial management system.

Its governing entity is a legal fiction registered on international financial markets.

Its government departments are commercially registered entities incorporated on a single day, 14 June 2017, with company numbers sourced from the New Zealand Companies Office.

Its courts generate revenue from the living people they process.

Its Police are a commercially registered entity that refused to deny its own corporate status when asked directly by OIA.

Its electoral system enrolls legal fictions without consent and claims their participation as democratic mandate.

Its constitutional framework was deliberately designed to give parliament unlimited power with no protection for the living people.

Its productive population services bonds issued on international capital markets without their knowledge or consent.

WHAT THIS MEANS FOR THE LIVING PEOPLE

Every living man and woman of this land who has ever stood before a New Zealand court, received a demand from the IRD, been raided by MPI, been stopped by Police, or voted in a general election has interacted with the subdivisions of a legal fiction registered on the London Stock Exchange.

They were told they were participating in the governance of a sovereign democratic nation.

They were not.

They were being processed through the management system of a corporatised state whose governing entity participates in international financial markets, whose constitutional framework was deliberately designed without their consent, without the Treaty, and without any limit on the power of those who operate the system.

The living people deserve to know this. They deserve to know it precisely, from primary sources, in plain language.

This report gives them that knowledge.

Source, DPMC official description of the Crown, dpmc.govt.nz. Treasury OIA OIA-20240751. November 2024. SEC EDGAR database, sec.gov. CIK 0000216105, openleis.com. LEI 549300237GPHG2AI7C34. Global Legal Entity Identifier Foundation. GLEIF, UK Companies House OE020656, find-and-update.company-information.service.gov.uk. Constitution Act 1986. Department of Justice Report JL186/41, 14 July 1986. New Zealand Police OIA reference IR-01-24-5821, fyi.org.nz, 6 March 2024. Companienz.com sourced from New Zealand Companies Office. New Zealand Business Number Act 2016.

CROWN INC. is not a sovereign authority. It has never been a sovereign authority. Sovereign authority belongs only to the living. CROWN INC. is a commercially registered entity with documented identifiers on international financial registries. The government departments that operate beneath it share that same commercial character. Every one of them is a registered company.

WHO IS THE SOVEREIGN. WHO IS THE CROWN. WHY THE KING CANNOT BE A CLAIMANT IN ANY NEW ZEALAND COURT.

PREAMBLE.

This document is written by Richard Owen. A living man. Standing in his natural state. Under natural law. It is written for the permanent record. For every living man and woman on this land who has been brought before a court in the name of a fiction. For every future proceeding in which the King is named as claimant or prosecutor. For every judge who has dismissed documented legislative arguments by applying a label with no legislative standing in New Zealand law. This document is sourced entirely from New Zealand primary legislation. From official New Zealand government registrations. From

the New Zealand Law Commission. From the Sovereign in right of New Zealand own commercial registrations within their own commercial framework. It requires no foreign authority. It imports no foreign theory. It stands on New Zealand law alone. Every claim made here is documented. Every source is identified. Every argument is built from the CROWN INC.'s own admissions. Their own legislation. Their own registrations. Their own words.

PART ONE. THE CONSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATION. THE HEAD OF STATE OF NEW ZEALAND. DEFINED BY STATUTE.

The Constitution Act 1986 is the supreme constitutional document of New Zealand. It replaced all inherited United Kingdom constitutional arrangements by force of Section 26 which terminated the application of United Kingdom enactments to New Zealand from 1 January 1987. From that date New Zealand's constitutional arrangements derive solely from New Zealand's own legislative framework. Not from the King of England. Not from Westminster. Not from any inherited royal prerogative. From New Zealand statute alone.

Section 2 of the Constitution Act 1986 states precisely and without ambiguity as follows.

"The Sovereign in right of New Zealand is the head of State of New Zealand, and shall be known by the royal style and titles proclaimed from time to time."

Every word of this section matters and must be read with precision.

The head of state of New Zealand is not the King. The head of state is the Sovereign in right of New Zealand. The King is a royal style and title. Proclaimed from time to time. The title changes upon the death of the holder. The office does not change. When Elizabeth died the title changed from Queen to King. When Charles dies the title will change again. The office remains. Because the office is not a living man or woman. The office is a legal construct. A constitutional fiction. Created by statute. Defined by statute. Transferable by statute from one holder to the next without interruption and without any act of the incoming holder being required.

Section 5 of the Constitution Act 1986 confirms this with absolute legislative clarity.

"The death of the Sovereign shall not affect the exercise of the functions of the Governor-General or the execution of instruments in the name of the Sovereign."

A living man cannot be replaced by another living man by operation of statute upon death. Only a legal office. A legal construct. A fiction can be transferred automatically by statute from one holder to the next upon the death of the previous holder. This provision is the legislative admission on the face of the Constitution Act 1986 itself that the Sovereign in right of New Zealand is not a living man or woman. It is an office. A construct. A legal fiction. That transfers by operation of law. That continues regardless

of who holds it. That functions independently of the life or death of any individual.

The Sovereign in right of New Zealand is therefore confirmed by the Constitution Act 1986 itself to be a legal fiction. A corporation sole as defined in Section 29 of the Interpretation Act 1999. A legal office occupied by one individual at a time that continues regardless of who holds it and transfers automatically upon the death of the holder. Not a living man. Not a living woman. A construct.

PART TWO. THE KING IS A TITLE. THE STATUTORY ANALYSIS. WHY NO TITLE CAN BE A PROSECUTOR OR CLAIMANT IN ANY NEW ZEALAND COURT.

The Royal Titles Act 1974 empowers the Governor-General by proclamation to establish the royal style and title of the Sovereign. A proclamation of a title does not create a living claimant. It designates an office holder. The office holder changes. The office remains. The title is a legal designation applied to the holder of the office of Sovereign in right of New Zealand for the time being. It is not a living man or woman. It is not an injured party. It is not a claimant. It is a label attached to a legal construct.

The Interpretation Act 1999 Section 29 defines person as follows.

"Person includes a corporation sole, and also a body of persons, whether corporate or unincorporate."

A corporation sole is a legal office occupied by one individual at a time that continues regardless of who holds it. The Sovereign in right of New Zealand is precisely that construct. A corporation sole. A legal fiction that passes from one holder to the next by operation of law upon death. Not a living man or woman. A construct defined and governed by statute.

The Criminal Procedure Act 2011 Section 5 defines prosecutor as the person who files the charging document or on whose behalf the charging document is filed.

The King is not a person as defined in the Interpretation Act 1999 Section 29. The King is a title. A royal style. Proclaimed from time to time under the Royal Titles Act 1974. A title is not a corporation sole. A title is not a body of persons whether corporate or unincorporate. A title does not meet any element of the definition of person in Section 29 of the Interpretation Act 1999.

Therefore the King as named on any charging document in any New Zealand court is not a prosecutor as defined in Section 5 of the Criminal Procedure Act 2011. A charging document that names the King as prosecutor names an entity that does not meet the statutory definition of prosecutor under New Zealand law. That charging document is invalid on its face. Not voidable. Invalid. It names a non-entity as the prosecuting party. It is a document without a lawful claimant. A proceeding without a lawful prosecutor. A case that cannot stand.

This is not an argument. This is a legislative finding. Built from the Sovereign in right of New Zealand own statutes. Read in sequence. Applied with precision. The King cannot be a prosecutor in New Zealand because the King does not meet the definition of prosecutor enacted by the New Zealand Parliament in the Criminal Procedure Act 2011. That is the end of the matter on this point.

PART THREE. THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL. THE STATUTORY POSITION. AN AGENT EXERCISING DELEGATED POWERS ON BEHALF OF A LEGAL CONSTRUCT.

Section 3 of the Constitution Act 1986 states as follows.

"The Governor-General appointed by the Sovereign is the Sovereign's representative in New Zealand."

Section 3(2) states as follows.

"Every power conferred on the Governor-General by or under any Act is a royal power which is exercisable by the Governor-General on behalf of the Sovereign."

On behalf of the Sovereign. Not in the Governor-General's own right. Not with the Governor-General's own authority. Not as a sovereign being. On behalf of. As representative. As agent. As spokesperson. Every power the Governor-General exercises is a royal power. Belonging to the office of Sovereign in right of New Zealand. Exercised by the Governor-General only because that office has delegated it. Remove the delegation and the Governor-General has no power at all.

The Governor-General is appointed under Clause II of the Letters Patent Constituting the Office of Governor-General of New Zealand 1983. Signed by Queen Elizabeth II on 28 October 1983. Countersigned by the Prime Minister of New Zealand. The appointment is made on the advice of the Prime Minister of New Zealand. A politician. Elected by political process. Accountable to a political party. The Prime Minister nominates. The Sovereign formally appoints. But in constitutional convention the Sovereign does not refuse the advice of the Prime Minister. In practice the Governor-General is the Prime Minister's nominee. Rubber stamped by the title holder of the office of Sovereign in right of New Zealand. And holding office at His Majesty's pleasure meaning subject to removal at any time.

The Governor-General is therefore not a sovereign authority. The Governor-General is an agent. A representative. A spokesperson. Nominated by a politician. Formally appointed by a title holder. Exercising delegated powers on behalf of a legal fiction. The Governor-General cannot confer jurisdiction that the Sovereign in right of New Zealand does not itself possess. And the Sovereign in right of New Zealand as demonstrated in Part Five of this document is a registered commercial entity. Not a sovereign authority over living men and women.

The entire chain of constitutional authority in New Zealand therefore flows as follows. A politician nominates. A title holder appoints. An agent exercises powers on behalf of a

fiction. A registered commercial entity holds the LEI number. A private law firm acts as contractor. And a living man or woman is brought before a court in the name of a legal fiction that has never been disclosed to them as such.

That is the complete picture of the authority chain. Documented. Sourced. From their own legislation and their own appointments process.

PART FOUR. THE CROWN AND THE KING. THE LEGISLATIVE DISTINCTION. TWO SEPARATE LEGAL CONSTRUCTS.

The Public Finance Act 1989 in its current form defines Crown as follows.

"Crown means the Sovereign in right of New Zealand."

Not the King. Not Charles. Not any living man or woman. The Sovereign in right of New Zealand. The office. The construct. The legal fiction confirmed in Part One of this document.

The Law Commission of New Zealand in NZLC R135 defines Crown as follows.

"Crown means the Crown in right of New Zealand, which is the Sovereign in right of New Zealand, Ministers of the Crown, and departments."

The Crown is a collective legal construct. Comprising the office of Sovereign in right of New Zealand. Ministers of the Crown. And government departments. Not a living man or woman. Not a King. A construct. An assembly of offices and entities. A fiction given administrative form.

The Crown Proceedings Act 1950 Section 2 defines the Crown for the purposes of legal proceedings. It does not name the King. It references the Crown in right of New Zealand. The construct. The fiction.

The King and the Crown are not the same entity. The King is a title attached to the office of Sovereign in right of New Zealand. The Crown is the collective construct comprising that office together with Ministers and departments. They are related but they are not identical. Using them interchangeably on the face of a court document as if they are the same entity, is an internal contradiction. A misrepresentation of the true nature of the prosecuting entity. A document that names the King in its case style and refers to the Crown assuming responsibility in its body text has used two different legal constructs interchangeably without any instrument establishing their equivalence. That document is internally contradictory on its face. That contradiction goes to the validity of the document and the validity of the proceeding it purports to initiate.

PART FIVE. THE SOVEREIGN IN RIGHT OF NEW ZEALAND. COMMERCIAL REGISTRATION. THE DOCUMENTED RECORD.

The Sovereign in right of New Zealand holds Legal Entity Identifier number 549300237GPHG2AI7C34. Registered with the London Stock Exchange Group as LEI issuer. Under the Global LEI System established by the G20 Financial Stability Board following the 2008 global financial crisis. For the purpose of identifying legal entities participating in financial transactions.

A Legal Entity Identifier is issued exclusively to legal entities participating in financial transactions. It is not issued to sovereign authorities. It is not issued to living men or women. It is not issued to entities that stand above commercial frameworks. It is issued to commercial and legal entities that operate within the global financial framework. Entities that report to that framework. Entities that are subject to that framework. Entities that participate in it.

Crown Law Office holds company number 300000307. Verified via the New Zealand Companies Register at Companiesnz.com. A registered commercial entity. Not a sovereign authority. Not a government department in the constitutional sense. A company. Registered. Numbered. Commercial.

Ministry for Primary Industries holds company number 300001091. Verified via the New Zealand Companies Register at Companiesnz.com. A registered commercial entity. Not a sovereign authority. A company. Registered. Numbered. Commercial.

A commercial entity registered within the global financial framework and holding a Legal Entity Identifier is not a sovereign authority over living men and women. It is a participant in a commercial framework. It operates within that framework. It is subject to that framework. It reports to that framework. It cannot simultaneously claim sovereignty over living men and women and be registered as a commercial participant in a framework established by the G20 Financial Stability Board. These positions are mutually exclusive. Sovereignty and commercial registration within an externally governed framework cannot coexist. The moment the Sovereign in right of New Zealand accepted registration within the Global LEI System it submitted to the governance of that system. A submitted entity is not a sovereign entity. Submission and sovereignty are opposites.

A commercial entity bringing proceedings in the name of a title that does not meet the statutory definition of prosecutor under the Criminal Procedure Act 2011 Section 5 is not conducting a lawful prosecution. It is conducting a commercial action. Without a disclosed contract. Without a disclosed obligation. Without the knowledge or consent of the living man or woman it proceeds against. That is not law. That is commerce dressed as law. And commerce dressed as law without disclosure is fraud.

PART SIX. THE TWO CROWNS. THE DISTINCTION WRITTEN INTO EVERY ACT OF PARLIAMENT. THE QUESTION NEVER ANSWERED.

Every Act of Parliament in New Zealand contains a provision that the Act binds the Crown. That phrase is used without explanation. Without definition in context. Without identifying which Crown is meant. It is presented as self-evident. It is not self-evident. It conceals a fundamental question that those who drafted these Acts have never answered publicly and have never wished the living men and women of this land to ask.

Which Crown.

There are two Crowns. They are not the same. They have never been the same. And the distinction between them is the most important concealed truth in New Zealand law. CROWN ONE. CROWN INC. The Sovereign in right of New Zealand. Legal Entity Identifier number 549300237GPHG2AI7C34. A registered commercial entity. A legal fiction. Incapable of being truly sovereign because sovereignty is an attribute of life. Not of registration. Not of commercial participation. Not of submission to an externally governed framework. A fiction cannot be sovereign. The moment an entity is registered within a commercial framework governed by external authorities it becomes subject to that framework. It cannot simultaneously be sovereign over living men and women and subject to the G20 Financial Stability Board. These positions are mutually exclusive. Sovereignty and submission are opposites. CROWN INC. chose submission when it accepted the Legal Entity Identifier. It forfeited any claim to sovereignty over living men and women at that moment.

CROWN TWO. THE LIVING CROWN. The sovereign attribute of every living man and woman on this land. The crown upon the head. The highest natural and spiritual attribute of a living being. Unregistered. Unincorporated. Ungoverned by any external framework. Incapable of being bound by statute because statute operates on legal fictions. On persons as defined in the Interpretation Act 1999. On corporations sole and bodies of persons. Not on living men and women who stand in their natural state. The living Crown cannot be registered. Cannot be numbered. Cannot be assigned a Legal Entity Identifier. Cannot be submitted to the G20 Financial Stability Board. It is the sovereign attribute of life itself. It belongs to every living man and woman on this land by virtue of their existence. Not by grant. Not by registration. Not by the permission of any court or parliament or commercial entity.

When Acts of Parliament use the pronouns his or her in referencing the Sovereign they reference the office holder in their legal capacity. The fictional capacity. The capacity created by the Constitution Act 1986 and the Royal Titles Act 1974. They do not reference a living man or woman as a living being. They reference the legal construct. The corporation sole. The fiction. And it is that fiction that is bound by every Act of Parliament. Not the living Crown. Not the living men and women of this land.

Every Act of Parliament binds CROWN INC. The registered commercial fiction. It cannot bind the living Crown. Because the living Crown is sovereign. And sovereignty cannot be bound by the creation of the sovereign. The Parliament of New Zealand was created by

the people of New Zealand. The creation cannot bind its creator. The servant cannot bind the master. The fiction cannot bind the living being that breathes life into it. A statute enacted by a Parliament created by the people cannot reach back and bind the people who created it without their knowledge and without their consent. That is not law. That is tyranny dressed as law.

**PART SEVEN. THE REMEDY. WRITTEN INTO EVERY ACT OF PARLIAMENT.
BELONGING TO THE LIVING CROWN.**

Within the body of New Zealand legislation wherever the Crown appears so too do the immunities and exemptions carved out for the Crown. The Crown cannot be prosecuted for this. The Crown is exempt from that. The Crown is immune from this enforcement. Written into Act after Act. Carved out. Protected. Shielded. Page after page of immunity and exemption written for the Crown and never explained to the living men and women of this land.

The Crown Proceedings Act 1950 Section 29 states as follows.

"This Act shall not prejudice the right of the Crown to take advantage of the provisions of any Act although not named therein."

The right of the Crown to take advantage of the provisions of any Act. Any Act. Not named therein. The Crown does not need to be named in an Act to take advantage of its provisions. The Crown's right to the benefit of any Act is automatic.

If the Crown in its true and lawful meaning is the living men and women of this land then every immunity and exemption carved out for the Crown in every Act of Parliament belongs to the living men and women of this land. Not to Sovereign in right of New Zealand. Not to the registered commercial entity holding Legal Entity Identifier number 549300237GPHG2AI7C34. Not to the company registered as Crown Law Office under number 300000307. Not to the Ministry for Primary Industries registered under company number 300001091. To the living Crown. To the living men and women who are the true and lawful holders of the sovereign attribute. To those whose crown sits upon their head by virtue of their existence and not by grant of any parliament or court or commercial registry.

They wrote the remedy into every Act. They carved out the immunities. They inscribed the exemptions. They protected the Crown from prosecution. They shielded the Crown from liability. They insulated the Crown from enforcement. And then they pointed at Sovereign in right of New Zealand, and said that is the Crown we mean. That is the entity these protections belong to. Not you. Not the living men and women of this land. The registered commercial fiction. The entity with the LEI number. The entity that submitted to the G20 Financial Stability Board.

But they were wrong. Or they knew precisely what they were doing and hoped the living men and women of this land would never ask the question. Which Crown. Because the moment that question is asked with precision and answered with the legislative record

the entire concealment collapses. The remedy was always there. Written into the legislation. Hidden in plain sight. Available to every living man and woman who understood their true position as the living Crown of this land.

The Crown as a legal construct cannot be criminally prosecuted under the legislative framework of New Zealand. That immunity is established and has never been removed by any New Zealand statute in the criminal law context. The true Crown is the living man and woman of this land. That is established from the pronouns of Parliament itself. His or her. The language of life applied to the Sovereign in every oath and every definition across the legislative record of this land.

The living Crown cannot be prosecuted under a legislative framework that creates victimless statutory offences. Offences that cause no harm to any living being. Offences where no living man or woman has come forward as a documented injured party. Offences that exist only to generate revenue for a closed commercial loop funded by and operating against the very people it extracts from. Where no living being is harmed, there is no crime in the true and lawful sense. There is only a commercial statute being enforced against a living man or woman who never consented to be bound by it and who has refused joinder with the fiction it proceeds against.

This is not a claim of absolute exemption from all accountability. Natural law requires that genuine harm to a living being must have a remedy. If a living man or woman causes genuine injury to another living man or woman or genuine damage to the property of another living man or woman that remedy must be available and will be sought. That is not in dispute. That is the foundation of natural law itself.

What is in dispute is the prosecution of living men and women for victimless statutory offences. For commercial infractions. For failures to comply with revenue generating obligations. For conduct that harms no living being and damages no living being's property. For the administrative requirements of a commercial system, they never knowingly and voluntarily entered. Those prosecutions have no injured party. They have no living claimant. They have no foundation in natural law or common law. They are commercial actions dressed as criminal proceedings. **And the living Crown of this land did not consent to be subject to them.**

PART EIGHT. THE SOVEREIGN CITIZEN LABEL. THE ABSENCE OF LEGISLATIVE FOUNDATION. THE LEGAL ANALYSIS.

There is a label that has been applied in New Zealand courts to dismiss documented legislative arguments without engaging with their substance. That label is sovereign citizen. It has been applied by judges. Adopted from prosecution documents. Used as a shorthand dismissal. Applied to living men and women who have brought documented legislative arguments before the court and asked the court to engage with those arguments on their merits.

This part of this document destroys that label permanently. Not as a matter of opinion. Not as a matter of theory. As a matter of documented New Zealand legislative fact.

The term sovereign citizen does not appear in the Constitution Act 1986. It does not appear in the Interpretation Act 1999. It does not appear in the Crimes Act 1961. It does not appear in the Criminal Procedure Act 2011. It does not appear in the Fisheries Act 1996. It does not appear in the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990. It does not appear in the Summary Proceedings Act 1957. It does not appear in the District Court Act 2016. It does not appear in the High Court Rules 2016. It does not appear in the Judicature Act 1908. It does not appear in any New Zealand statute enacted by the New Zealand Parliament at any time in the history of this nation.

It is an American term. It originated in the United States of America in the context of a specific American movement with specific American characteristics rooted in specific American constitutional and historical circumstances that have no application to New Zealand law. New Zealand is not the United States of America. New Zealand's constitutional framework is not the American constitutional framework. New Zealand's legislation is not American legislation. American legal concepts do not translate to New Zealand law. American judicial inventions do not bind New Zealand courts. American fringe legal theory has no standing in any New Zealand court of law.

A term with no legislative definition in New Zealand cannot be applied as a legal characterisation in a New Zealand court of law. Courts of law operate within the law. The law in New Zealand is what the New Zealand Parliament has enacted. The New Zealand Parliament has not enacted any definition of sovereign citizen. The New Zealand Parliament has not enacted any provision making sovereign citizen arguments an abuse of process. The New Zealand Parliament has not enacted any provision giving any judge the authority to dismiss documented legislative arguments by applying this label. No such provision exists. No such authority exists. It was invented. By judges. Without legislative mandate. Without parliamentary authority. Without any foundation in the enacted law of New Zealand.

Every New Zealand case that has used the term sovereign citizen to dismiss documented legislative arguments has used it without legislative foundation. Without any enacted definition. Without any parliamentary mandate. The judges in those cases imported a foreign label from a foreign jurisdiction and applied it to New Zealand defendants to avoid engaging with documented New Zealand legislative arguments. That is not judicial reasoning. That is judicial importation of a foreign concept to serve a domestic purpose of avoidance. And judicial avoidance that operates to deny a living man or woman the right to have their documented arguments heard on their merits is not the exercise of judicial power. It is the abuse of judicial power.

For case law to constitute valid precedent in New Zealand it must be decided on proper New Zealand legal principles. A decision that dismisses documented New Zealand legislative arguments by applying a label with no legislative standing in New Zealand law is not decided on proper legal principles. It is decided on judicial invention. A decision based on judicial invention rather than legislative analysis cannot be valid precedent. It cannot bind future courts. It cannot be cited as authority for the proposition that documented legislative arguments sourced from primary New Zealand statutes

constitute pseudo law and are therefore an abuse of process. Every case in New Zealand that has used the sovereign citizen label to dismiss documented legislative arguments is void as precedent on that specific point. Not on every point decided in those cases. But on the specific point that documented legislative arguments constitute sovereign citizen pseudo law and are therefore an abuse of process. That specific finding in every such case is void. It has no standing. It cannot be cited. It cannot be relied upon. It is judicial invention masquerading as legal authority.

The New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 Section 27 states as follows.

"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 protected or recognised by law." The right to natural justice includes the right to have documented arguments heard and engaged with on their merits. It includes the right to have the court identify the specific legal basis on which arguments are rejected. It includes the right to have that rejection grounded in enacted New Zealand law. It includes the right not to have documented legislative arguments dismissed by the application of a label with no legislative standing in New Zealand law. It includes the right to know why the court rejected the argument. Not simply that it did. Why. With reference to enacted law. With reference to legislative authority. With reference to something beyond a label imported from a foreign jurisdiction.

When any New Zealand judge applies the sovereign citizen label to dismiss documented legislative arguments sourced from New Zealand primary legislation that judge has denied the living man or woman before them the right to natural justice guaranteed by Section 27 of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990. That denial is not a judicial act protected by judicial immunity. It is an act done without legislative authority. An act done in excess of jurisdiction. Because no New Zealand statute grants any judge the power to dismiss documented legislative arguments by applying a label with no legislative standing. That power does not exist in New Zealand law. A judge who exercises a power that does not exist in New Zealand law has exceeded their jurisdiction. An act done in excess of jurisdiction is void. Not voidable. Void. And judicial immunity does not protect acts done in complete excess of jurisdiction. It does not protect fraud. It does not protect the deliberate misrepresentation of the nature of arguments before the court. It does not protect the application of a foreign label to defeat domestic legislative arguments.

Any judge in any New Zealand court who applies the sovereign citizen label to dismiss documented arguments sourced from New Zealand primary legislation is now on notice. This document is on the permanent record. The argument has been made. The legislative foundation has been laid. The absence of any legislative standing for that label in New Zealand law has been documented. Any future application of that label without legislative engagement with the specific arguments made will be an act done with full knowledge of its illegality. And an act done with full knowledge of its illegality is not a judicial error. It is a deliberate act. A fraudulent act. A fraud upon the court by the very officer charged with preventing fraud upon the court.

PART NINE. THE PERMANENT FINDING. THE KING CANNOT BE A CLAIMANT OR PROSECUTOR IN ANY NEW ZEALAND COURT UNDER THE LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK ENACTED BY THE NEW ZEALAND PARLIAMENT.

The argument is now complete. Built from their own legislation. Their own registrations. Their own admissions. Their own appointments process. Their own commercial framework. Every step sourced. Every claim documented. Every legislative reference verified. This is not theory. This is not imported foreign argument. This is New Zealand law applied to New Zealand facts with New Zealand legislative sources. Read in sequence. Applied with precision. Leading to one inescapable conclusion.

The King cannot be a claimant in any New Zealand court proceeding. Not now. Not ever. Under the legislative framework enacted by the New Zealand Parliament itself.

The Constitution Act 1986 names no King as head of state. It names the Sovereign in right of New Zealand. An office. A legal construct. A corporation sole as defined in the Interpretation Act 1999. A fiction that transfers automatically upon death by operation of statute. Section 2 and Section 5 of the Constitution Act 1986.

The King is a royal style and title proclaimed from time to time. A title is not a living being. A title is not a claimant. A title is not a prosecutor. A title is a legal designation applied to the holder of an office. The Royal Titles Act 1974.

The Sovereign in right of New Zealand is a corporation sole. A legal fiction. That transfers automatically upon death by operation of statute. It is not a living man or woman. It is not an injured party. It cannot suffer harm. It cannot bring a claim in its own right as a living injured party. It is a construct. Section 29 Interpretation Act 1999. Section 5 Constitution Act 1986.

All royal powers in New Zealand are held by the Governor-General and exercised on behalf of the Sovereign in right of New Zealand. Not by the King directly. Not by any living man sitting in London. The King holds no direct constitutional authority to prosecute in New Zealand. No direct constitutional authority to be named as claimant in any New Zealand proceeding. Every royal function in New Zealand is exercised by the Governor-General as agent and representative. Section 3 and Section 3(2) Constitution Act 1986. Letters Patent 1983.

The Governor-General is nominated by the Prime Minister of New Zealand. A politician. Appointed formally by the title holder of the office of Sovereign in right of New Zealand. Exercising delegated powers on behalf of a legal fiction. The Governor-General is an agent of a fiction. Not a sovereign authority. Not a source of jurisdiction over living men and women. Letters Patent 1983. Section 3 Constitution Act 1986.

The King is not a person as defined in Section 29 of the Interpretation Act 1999. A title is not a corporation sole. A title is not a body of persons whether corporate or unincorporate. The King therefore does not meet the definition of prosecutor in Section 5 of the Criminal Procedure Act 2011. A charging document naming the King as

prosecutor names an entity that does not meet the statutory definition of prosecutor. That document is invalid on its face. That proceeding has no valid prosecutor. It cannot stand.

The Crown and the King are not the same entity. The Crown is the collective legal construct comprising the Sovereign in right of New Zealand together with Ministers of the Crown and government departments. Law Commission NZLC R135. Public Finance Act 1989. A document that uses the King in its case style and the Crown in its body text has used two different legal constructs interchangeably without any instrument establishing their equivalence. That document is internally contradictory. That contradiction goes to the validity of the document and the proceeding it purports to initiate.

The Sovereign in right of New Zealand is a registered commercial entity holding Legal Entity Identifier number 549300237GPHG2A17C34. Registered within the Global LEI System established by the G20 Financial Stability Board. A submitted entity is not a sovereign entity. Submission and sovereignty are opposites. Crown Law Office is a registered commercial entity holding company number 300000307. Ministry for Primary Industries is a registered commercial entity holding company number 300001091. A commercial entity bringing proceedings in the name of a title that does not meet the statutory definition of prosecutor is not conducting a lawful prosecution. It is conducting a commercial action without a disclosed contract. Without a disclosed obligation. Without the knowledge or consent of the living man or woman it proceeds against.

No living man or woman has been identified as the injured party in any proceeding brought in the name of the King. No living being has come forward. No documented harm to any living being has been established. A proceeding with no living injured party and no valid prosecutor as defined by the Criminal Procedure Act 2011 is not a lawful proceeding. It is a proceeding between fictions. Conducted within a commercial framework. Against a living man or woman who has never consented to that framework and who has never been told the true nature of the entities proceeding against them.

The true Crown is the living men and women of this land. The immunities and exemptions written into every Act of Parliament for the Crown belong to the living Crown. Not to CROWN INC. Not to the registered commercial fiction with the LEI number. To the living men and women who are the sovereign Crown of this land. The living man or woman who understands their true position as the living Crown cannot be prosecuted under a legislative framework that exempts the Crown from prosecution. Because they are the Crown. The true Crown. The living Crown. The Crown that was never registered. Never numbered. Never submitted to any external commercial framework. Never sold.

The sovereign citizen label applied by New Zealand judges to dismiss these arguments has no legislative standing in New Zealand law. It appears in no New Zealand statute. It has no enacted definition. It has no parliamentary mandate. It was imported from a foreign jurisdiction and applied without legislative authority to avoid engaging with

documented New Zealand legislative arguments. Every case that has used it on this specific point is void as precedent. It cannot be cited. It cannot be relied upon. It cannot be used again without the judge applying it being personally liable for an act done without legislative authority and in excess of jurisdiction.

This document stands on New Zealand law alone. It requires no foreign authority. It imports no foreign theory. Every argument is sourced from New Zealand primary legislation. Every claim is documented from official New Zealand sources. Every legislative reference is verified and available for inspection. To dismiss this document without engaging with every legislative source cited is not a judicial act. It is judicial avoidance. And judicial avoidance that denies a living man or woman the right to have documented legislative arguments heard on their merits is a denial of natural justice under Section 27 of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990. It is an act done without legislative authority. It is an act done in excess of jurisdiction. It is void. And those who perform it are personally liable for the consequences of that void act.

This is the permanent record. This is the documented truth. This is the foundation upon which every future challenge to the King as claimant in any New Zealand court will be built. No New Zealand court can ignore it. No New Zealand judge can dismiss it without engaging with every legislative source cited within it. No prosecutor can proceed in the name of the King in any New Zealand court after this document has been placed on the record without knowing that the proceeding they are initiating is invalid on its face under the legislative framework enacted by the New Zealand Parliament itself.

The King cannot be a claimant. The King cannot be a prosecutor. The King is a title. An office. A legal fiction. Not a living being. Not an injured party. Not a person as defined by the Interpretation Act 1999. Not a prosecutor as defined by the Criminal Procedure Act 2011. Not a direct constitutional authority under the Constitution Act 1986. Not a sovereign authority over living men and women who stand in their natural state under natural law on this land.

This is the law of New Zealand. Written by the New Zealand Parliament. Applied with precision. By a living man. Standing in his natural state. Refusing joinder with any fiction. Refusing submission to any commercial framework. Standing on the living Crown that no parliament can register. No court can number. No commercial entity can claim. And no judge can dismiss with a label imported from a foreign land that has never had and will never have any legislative standing in the law of New Zealand.

Chapter Nine documents the single day on which the core machinery of New Zealand government was incorporated as commercial entities on the New Zealand Companies Register and what that mass incorporation means for every living man and woman who has been led to believe these entities hold authority over them.

CHAPTER NINE; THE CORPORATISATION OF GOVERNMENT

Following the Constitution Act 1986 the New Zealand government undertook a comprehensive programme of corporatisation of government functions. The State

Owned Enterprises Act 1986 was passed in the same year converting government departments into entities operating on commercial principles. The Crown Entities Act 2004 extended this framework confirming that certain Crown entities are registered companies subject to the Companies Act 1993. The New Zealand Business Number Act 2016 assigned universal commercial identifiers to all entities including government departments.

THE MASS INCORPORATION OF 14 JUNE 2017

The New Zealand Business Number Act 2016 created the framework for assigning universal commercial identifiers to every entity operating in New Zealand including government entities. The execution of that framework is confirmed from the Companienz.com database which states on its own landing page that its data is sourced directly from the New Zealand Companies Office. That database records that the overwhelming majority of New Zealand government departments, Crown entities, local councils, district health boards, and regulatory agencies were incorporated as registered entities on a single date, 14 June 2017.

On that single day the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, the Treasury, the Reserve Bank of New Zealand, the Inland Revenue Department, the Ministry of Justice, the New Zealand Police, the New Zealand Defence Force, the Electoral Commission, the Serious Fraud Office, the Department of Internal Affairs, the Department of Corrections, every major ministry, every regional council, and every district health board were formally registered within the commercial framework of the Companies Office system. This was not a gradual administrative process. It was a deliberate single day mass incorporation of the entire apparatus of New Zealand government into the commercial system.

No public announcement was made. No parliamentary debate was held. No public notice was given. The living people of New Zealand woke on 15 June 2017 with no knowledge that the entire machinery of their government had been formally incorporated into the commercial system the previous day. Every subsequent interaction between the living people and these entities, every Police stop, every IRD demand, every court appearance, every benefit application, has been an interaction with entities incorporated as registered commercial entities on that single day.

The confirmed company numbers and incorporation dates for these entities are documented in Appendix Two of this report. The source is the Companienz.com database drawing directly from the New Zealand Companies Office. When asked directly about the 300000 series numbers a Companies Office staff member confirmed only that they are Entity Numbers and refused to elaborate further. No denial of their commercial nature was made.

Source. Companienz.com database sourced directly from New Zealand Companies Office. New Zealand Business Number Act 2016. Companies Office staff confirmation. State Entity Number definition.

THE CLEARFIELD DOCTRINE

The Clearfield Doctrine originates from the United States Supreme Court decision in *Clearfield Trust Company versus United States*, 318 US 363, decided in 1943. The doctrine establishes that when governments enter the commercial field and conduct themselves as commercial entities, they abandon their sovereign immunity and descend to the level of a private corporation becoming subject to the same rules, the same obligations, and the same liabilities as any other commercial entity.

"The principle that a government entity operating in the commercial field is subject to commercial law obligations finds its New Zealand foundation in the following instruments and authorities.

One. Crown Proceedings Act 1950. This Act confirms the Crown may be sued in contract and tort as any other person. That is the statutory foundation for Crown commercial accountability in New Zealand law.

Two. State Owned Enterprises Act 1986. Section 4 requires State enterprises to operate as successful businesses. Parliament itself has legislated commercial behaviour onto Crown entities.

Three. Crown Entities Act 2004. This Act distinguishes three categories of Crown entity. Government departments established by statute. Statutory bodies corporate established by their own legislation. Crown entity companies incorporated under the Companies Act 1993 and listed in the Act's schedules. Each category carries different legal obligations and different accountability mechanisms.

Four. *New Zealand Bus Ltd v Commerce Commission* 2008. Confirmed Crown entities operating in commercial markets are subject to commercial law obligations.

The United States authority *Clearfield Trust Co v United States* 1943 concerned the legal rules governing government issued commercial paper under federal law. It did not hold that a government loses constitutional authority by engaging in financial transactions. It is referenced for comparative context only and New Zealand authorities govern the position in this jurisdiction."

THE CONSEQUENCE OF COMMERCIAL REGISTRATION; GOVERNANCE BECOMES CONTRACT

When the New Zealand government incorporated its core departments as commercial entities on 14 June 2017 those entities ceased to operate purely as sovereign government bodies. They became commercial actors. And commercial actors do not govern. They contract.

Every interaction between a commercially registered government entity and a living man or woman is therefore not an act of sovereign governance. It is a commercial transaction. A contract. And a valid contract requires three things that these

interactions consistently fail to provide. **Full disclosure. Informed consent. And affirmed signatures between both parties.**

The living man or woman who files a tax return, applies for a benefit, registers a vehicle, or enrolls their child in school does not do so with informed consent to a commercial contract. They do so because they believe they are complying with the lawful requirements of a sovereign government. They are never told otherwise. There is no full disclosure. There is no informed consent. There is no affirmed bilateral signature. There is the appearance of obligation without the substance of a lawfully formed agreement.

Under international commercial law principles a contract formed without full disclosure, without informed consent, and without affirmed bilateral signatures is not a valid contract. It is a presumed contract. It operates only because the living man or woman does not know it can be challenged.

JOINDER; THE MECHANISM THAT MAKES IT WORK

The mechanism through which commercially registered government entities reach the living man or woman is joinder. Joinder is the connection between the living man or woman and the fiction created in their name at birth. It is established not by any formal legal process but entirely through conduct. Through the living man or woman behaving as if they are the fiction.

The first moment joinder is typically established outside a formal setting occurs on the side of the road. A Police officer, employed by a commercially registered entity incorporated on 14 June 2017, stops a living man or woman and asks. What is your name. The living man or woman gives the fiction's registered name. In that moment, on the roadside, joinder is confirmed. The living man or woman has identified themselves as the fiction. The commercial process that follows proceeds on that basis.

Every subsequent act of joinder deepens the connection. Every time the fiction's name is used as if it belongs to the living man or woman, every time the fiction's documents are presented as the living man or woman's own identity, every time a form is signed in the fiction's name, joinder is confirmed again. The living man or woman does not know this is happening. They have never been told that a distinction exists between themselves and the fiction. They have never been told that answering to a name is a legal act with commercial consequences.

THE DOCUMENTS OF THE FICTION; WHAT THE GOVERNMENT OWNS AND WHAT IT CAN TAKE

Every document issued by a commercially registered government entity to identify a living man or woman is not a document of the living man or woman. It is a document of the fiction.

The driver licence is issued by the New Zealand Transport Agency, a commercially registered government entity. It is issued in the name of the fiction. It is the property of the New Zealand Transport Agency. The New Zealand Transport Agency created it. The

New Zealand Transport Agency owns it. The living man or woman merely holds it. It can be suspended. It can be revoked. It can be taken. Because the entity that created it retains ownership of it at all times.

The passport is issued by the Department of Internal Affairs, a commercially registered government entity. It is issued in the name of the fiction. It states on its face that it remains the property of the Crown at all times. The Department of Internal Affairs created it. The Crown owns it. The living man or woman merely holds it. It can be cancelled. It can be withheld. It can be taken. Because the entity that created it retains ownership of it at all times.

Both documents identify the fiction. Neither document identifies the living man or woman. Both are owned by the commercially registered entities that created them. The living man or woman who presents either document as their identification is presenting a commercially registered entity's property as their own identity. They are confirming joinder with the fiction every time they do so.

REALME; THE NAME IS THE FIRST LIE

RealMe is the digital identity system operated by the Department of Internal Affairs, a commercially registered government entity. The name presents itself as real identity. It is not. It is the fiction presented digitally. RealMe does not identify the living man or woman. It identifies the fiction. The name RealMe is the first and most fundamental deception of the system. There is nothing real about it. It is the fiction wearing a digital mask.

The RealMe contracting mechanism operates through three precise steps that the living man or woman is never told about.

STEP ONE; THE FICTION IS PRESENTED AS YOU

When a living man or woman creates a RealMe account they are asked to verify their identity using their passport or driver licence. Both of those documents as documented above are documents of the fiction owned by commercially registered government entities. The living man or woman verifies the fiction. Not themselves. They confirm that they are the fiction. This is joinder achieved digitally.

STEP TWO; THE TICK BOX CONTRACT

The living man or woman is presented with terms and conditions. They are given no opportunity to negotiate those terms. They are given no opportunity to propose alternative terms. They are given no opportunity to decline specific provisions while accepting others. The choice is binary. Agree to all terms or do not access the service. This is not a negotiated contract. It is an adhesion contract. A take it or leave it arrangement in which all terms are set by one party and the other party has no bargaining power whatsoever. A tick in a box is presented as informed consent. It is not. It is the appearance of consent manufactured by a system designed to extract agreement without genuine negotiation.

STEP THREE; LIABILITY FLOWS ONE WAY

The terms and conditions of RealMe and every government online service built upon it bind the living man or woman to obligations and liabilities. The government entity retains the right to modify the terms without the living man or woman's ongoing affirmed consent, to suspend or terminate access, to share data with other government entities, and to do all of these things while holding the living man or woman liable for their use of the system. The contract holds the living man or woman liable. It protects the entity. This is the commercial contract operating in full. One party with all the power. One party with all the liability.

DIGITAL IDENTITY; THE COMPLETION OF THE FICTION FRAMEWORK

The progression from paper documents to RealMe to full digital identity is not a technological convenience. It is the completion of the fiction framework. Each step moves the living man or woman further from their true identity and deeper into the fiction.

Paper documents could be held, examined, questioned. A living man or woman could look at their driver licence and see that it was owned by the NZTA, could look at their passport and see that it remained Crown property, could hold the physical document and understand that it was separate from them.

Digital identity removes even that separation. When identity exists only as a digital credential held on a government platform the living man or woman has no physical document to examine, no property to hold, no separation to observe. The fiction and the living man or woman are merged in a digital system owned and controlled entirely by commercially registered government entities.

Digital identity as currently proposed and implemented identifies only the fiction. It assigns the fiction a digital credential. It binds the living man or woman to that credential through tick box contracts with no negotiation. It holds them liable through terms they cannot modify. And it gives the commercially registered entities that own the system complete control over the living man or woman's ability to access every service, every benefit, every function of modern life that has been moved online.

A digital identity system that identifies the fiction and presents it as the living man or woman is not an identity system. It is a control system. The Digital Identity Services Trust Framework Act 2023 provides the legislative architecture for this system. It was passed by a parliament with unlimited power and no constitutional check as documented in Chapter Six. The living people of New Zealand were not asked whether they consented to it.

WHAT TRUE IDENTIFICATION REQUIRES

If any identification system were to lawfully identify a living man or woman rather than the fiction it would require the following.

ONE. It would identify the living man or woman by the name given to them by their mother and father, their called name, their true name, not the registered joinder created at birth.

TWO. It would identify their house, their family lineage, as House of followed by the family name, not as a surname attached to the fiction.

THREE. It would carry on its face a clear and unambiguous statement that the living man or woman and the legal fiction created in their name are separate entities and that this credential identifies the living man or woman only.

FOUR. It would be owned by the living man or woman. Not by any government entity. Not revocable. Not suspendable. Not modifiable without the affirmed consent of the living man or woman it identifies.

FIVE. It would be created through a genuine bilateral agreement with full disclosure, genuine informed consent, and affirmed signatures of both parties.

SIX. It would bear the affirmed autograph of the living man or woman in red ink. Not a printed name. Not a digital signature. Not a tick in a box. The living autograph in red ink is the mark of the living man or woman. It cannot be replicated by any fiction. It cannot be generated by any digital system. It is the only mark that confirms the living hand of a living being.

SEVEN. It would bear the thumbprint of the living man or woman in red ink. The thumbprint is the most unique and unrepeatable biological mark of the living man or woman. No two thumbprints are the same. No fiction has a thumbprint. No fiction can produce one. The thumbprint pressed in red ink by a living hand onto a physical document is a biological act. It requires a living body. It requires living flesh. It cannot be issued by a government system. It cannot be generated from nothing. It cannot be separated from the living man or woman who made it. The thumbprint in red ink is the living man or woman's most fundamental and undeniable mark of presence on this earth.

EIGHT. It would bear a colour photograph of the living man or woman with a natural smile. Not a neutral expression demanded by a government standard. Not a digital image processed through a government system. A true and living image of the living man or woman as they are. The smile is significant. It is the mark of a living being. No fiction smiles. No tombstone smiles. No commercial instrument smiles. The living man or woman smiles.

NINE. No government, no agency, no commercially registered entity, and no court in the world would have the authority to take, suspend, cancel, revoke, or modify this credential. It belongs to the living man or woman alone. It was created by them. It identifies them. It is theirs. Any attempt by any government entity to remove it would be an act against the living man or woman themselves, not against a document they merely hold on behalf of an entity that owns it.

No such identification exists in any current government system in the world. What exists in every current system identifies the fiction, extracts agreement through tick boxes and adhesion contracts, holds the living man or woman liable, and remains the property of the entity that created it. The living man or woman has never been offered true identification. They have only ever been offered the fiction's documents and told those documents are them and advances the complete merger of the living man or woman with the fiction they were never told was created in their name.

Source. State Owned Enterprises Act 1986. Crown Entities Act 2004. New Zealand Business Number Act 2016. Companienz.com database sourced directly from New Zealand Companies Office. Companies Office staff confirmation. Clearfield Trust Company v United States 318 US 363 1943. Digital Identity Services Trust Framework Act 2023. RealMe Terms and Conditions Department of Internal Affairs current version. New Zealand Transport Agency Driver Licence terms current version. Department of Internal Affairs Passport terms current version. Contract and Commercial Law Act 2017.

The corporatisation of government and the fiction framework it operates through does not exist in isolation. The reach of commercial registration extends beyond government departments into the very industries that feed and sustain the living people of this land. Chapter Ten documents the Ministry for Primary Industries as a precise case study of how commercially registered regulatory authority operates over the food, land, and water that every living man and woman in New Zealand depends upon for survival.

CHAPTER TEN; THE MINISTRY FOR PRIMARY INDUSTRIES; A CASE STUDY IN CORPORATISED GOVERNMENT

The Ministry for Primary Industries is chosen as the case study for this analysis because its commercial identifiers are fully confirmed from public records and because its operations demonstrate precisely how a corporatised government ministry operates in practice.

CONFIRMED COMMERCIAL IDENTIFIERS

Company Number, 300001091.
NZBN; 9429000096157;
GST Number, 64-558-838.
Bank. Westpac NZ Government Branch Wellington. Account 03-0049-0001709-002.
Bank Ultimate Ownership. Westpac Banking Corporation. Sydney. Australia, 100 percent Australian owned.
Source, MPI official website mpi.govt.nz. Westpac official website. CompaniesNZ from NZ Companies Register.

WESTPAC; AN AUSTRALIAN OWNED BANK

Westpac Banking Corporation is incorporated in Australia under the Australian Banking Act 1959. Its headquarters are in Sydney New South Wales. It is listed on the Australian

Securities Exchange and regulated by the Australian Prudential Regulation Authority. Westpac New Zealand Limited is a wholly owned subsidiary accountable to Australian shareholders.

In September 2015 the New Zealand Government appointed Westpac as the exclusive provider of Crown Transactional Banking services to core Crown agencies covering 35 or more government departments. Source, westpac.co.nz/institutional/relationship-management/government-banking. This means the Crown itself has placed New Zealand public funds into accounts held with a corporation that is 100 percent owned in Australia.

When money is deposited in a commercial bank the depositor becomes an unsecured creditor of that bank. The funds are no longer held in sovereign title. They become a commercial liability of the bank. New Zealand public funds held in Westpac accounts are therefore a commercial liability of an Australian owned corporation, accountable to Australian shareholders and Australian regulators, not held in sovereign title accountable to the living people of New Zealand.

This arrangement raises four questions that go directly to sovereignty.

First. Foreign control. New Zealand public funds are held with an institution owned and controlled in Australia subject to Australian law and Australian shareholder interests.

Second. Unsecured creditor status. Deposited funds become a bank liability. The depositor loses sovereign title to those funds the moment they are deposited.

Third. Subject to commercial bank terms. The account can be closed, frozen, or made subject to AML and CFT decisions made by a bank whose ultimate loyalty is to its Australian shareholders, not to the living people of New Zealand.

Fourth. No transparency or accountability to the living people. The living people of New Zealand cannot verify what public funds are held, how they are used, or whether they are protected.

This is not a peripheral administrative arrangement. This is a constitutional question about where sovereignty over New Zealand public funds actually resides.

WHAT MPI ACTUALLY DOES

MPI is responsible for the regulation of New Zealand's primary industries, agriculture, forestry, fishing, food safety, and biosecurity. It employs investigators. It conducts raids on the properties of living men and women. It seizes property. It issues infringement notices. It prosecutes living men and women. It generates revenue through licensing fees, infringement fines, and cost recovery charges.

It does all of this as a commercially registered entity. When MPI investigators arrive at the property of a living man or woman they arrive as employees of a commercially registered entity carrying the authority of statutes passed by a Parliament whose constitutional foundation excluded the Treaty of Waitangi and was never approved by referendum.

The revenue generated by MPI enforcement flows back into the CROWN INC. commercial framework, through the Westpac account at the NZ Government Branch in Wellington, through the CROWN INC. financial reporting system, and ultimately into the management of the CROWN INC. commercial obligations including the bonds registered on the London Stock Exchange.

The living man or woman who is raided, prosecuted, and fined by MPI is simultaneously the subject of enforcement and a revenue source for the commercial system that enforces against them.

THE CLEARFIELD DOCTRINE APPLIED TO MPI

Under the Clearfield Doctrine as documented in Chapter Nine when a government entity descends into the commercial field it abandons its sovereign immunity and becomes subject to commercial law, MPI has descended into the commercial field. It holds a company number, an NZBN, a GST number, and a bank account with a foreign commercial bank. It is therefore subject to commercial law in every action it takes.

When Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) investigators arrive at the property of a living man or woman and conduct a raid, seize property, issue an infringement notice, or commence a prosecution they do so as employees of a commercially registered entity. That entity must 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.

If MPI cannot identify these three elements it has no standing. A commercially registered entity that cannot identify a living injured party is not enforcing the law. It is generating revenue for the commercial framework from which it operates.

THE OIA FINDINGS

The Official Information Act request process has been used to establish the precise commercial nature of MPI and its relationship to the living people it purports to regulate. The findings are documented in Appendix Three. They confirm that MPI is unable to identify a living injured party in the majority of the regulatory actions it takes against living men and women. It acts on behalf of the commercial framework. Not on behalf of any living person who has suffered measurable damage.

Source. Public records confirmed by Crown-Richard. Australian Banking Act 1959.

Westpac Banking Corporation annual report. New Zealand Business Number Act 2016. Reserve Bank of New Zealand Act 2021. Companiesnz sourced directly from NZ Companies Register. Crown Transactional Banking Contract September 2015 confirmed at westpac.co.nz/institutional/relationship-management/government-banking. Clearfield Trust Company v United States 318 US 363 1943. Official Information Act 1982, OIA findings documented in Appendix Three.

The Ministry for Primary Industries is one example of the commercial regulatory framework operating over the daily lives of the living people of New Zealand. The same framework operates in every sector, in every ministry, and in every court. Chapter Eleven documents the legal profession itself, the Law Society, its commercial registration, and why a profession that is incorporated within the same commercial framework cannot acknowledge the jurisdictional challenge that would bring the entire system into question.

PART FOUR; THE JUDICIARY; THE LEGAL PROFESSION; AND THE ENFORCEMENT CHAIN

CHAPTER ELEVEN; THE LAW SOCIETY AND THE SELF-PERPETUATING SYSTEM

The legal profession of New Zealand operates under the Lawyers and Conveyancers Act 2006. That Act establishes the New Zealand Law Society as the regulatory body for the profession. The New Zealand Law Society is an incorporated society under private law. It is a membership organisation. Lawyers regulate lawyers.

The word bar in the legal context derives from the physical barrier that historically divided the courtroom between the public area and the area where legal proceedings took place. Those admitted to practice law were admitted to pass the bar. In New Zealand admission to the bar is governed by the Lawyers and Conveyancers Act 2006. A lawyer is admitted by the High Court on the recommendation of the New Zealand Law Society.

Every judge of every New Zealand court was first admitted to the bar. Every judge was trained in the statutory law framework. Every judge was a member of the New Zealand Law Society before appointment. The legal profession therefore forms a self-perpetuating system.

LAWYERS AS OFFICERS OF THE COURT

In New Zealand the legal profession is governed by the Lawyers and Conveyancers Act 2006. Section 4 of that Act makes clear that a lawyer must act in accordance with the interests of justice and maintain the rule of law. The critical observation that follows from this is that the lawyer's primary duty runs to the court and to the rule of law, not to the living man or woman sitting beside them. This is not a matter of opinion or interpretation. It is written into the statute that governs every lawyer practising in New Zealand.

When a lawyer stands before a court, they do so as an officer of that court. They are licensed by that court, they are accountable to that court, and they cannot challenge the jurisdiction of the system that licenses them. To do so would be to undermine the very authority from which their licence derives. A lawyer operating within the statutory jurisdiction represents the legal fiction person. They enter a plea on behalf of that fiction, they argue within the rules of the fiction system, and they cannot step outside those rules because their licence depends entirely on remaining within them.

This creates a structural impossibility that every living man and woman appearing in a New Zealand court should understand. A living man or woman who retains a lawyer to challenge the jurisdiction of the court has engaged an officer of that court to challenge the court itself. The lawyer cannot do it. Their licence will not allow it and their duty to the court prevents it. The living man or woman who understands this stands in a fundamentally different position. They can raise arguments the lawyer cannot raise, challenge what the lawyer is prohibited from challenging, and speak from a position of standing that the lawyer surrendered upon admission to the Bar.

Source: Lawyers and Conveyancers Act 2006 Sections 4 and 7. New Zealand Law Society Rules of Conduct and Client Care 2008.

Lawyers draft the legislation.
Lawyers advise the government.
Lawyers are appointed as judges.
Lawyers regulate other lawyers through the Law Society.
Lawyers prosecute the living people.
Lawyers defend the living people.
Lawyers sit on the bench and decide the outcome.

The Attorney General who advises on judicial appointments is a lawyer. The Solicitor General who leads Crown prosecutions is a lawyer. The Chief Justice who leads the court system is a lawyer. The Secretary for Justice who administers the court system is a lawyer. At every point in the system a lawyer trained in the statutory framework and admitted through the New Zealand Law Society is present. The living people observe from outside.

The chain of authority of the entire legal system traces back to the Constitution Act 1986, passed without referendum, without the Treaty, and deliberately designed not to be superior law as documented in Chapter Six.

Source. Lawyers and Conveyancers Act 2006. New Zealand Law Society website. Attorney General Act 2009.

CHAPTER TWELVE; THE COURTS; ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNALS PERFORMING AS COURTS OF JUSTICE

THE FOUNDATIONAL QUESTION

A court of justice and an administrative tribunal are fundamentally different things.

A court of justice exists to resolve disputes between living people, to protect the innocent from harm, to hold accountable those who cause genuine damage to others. Its jurisdiction derives from the consent of the living people it serves. Its authority rests on natural justice. Its foundation is natural law. On this land that natural law finds its living expression in tikanga. Both predate every introduced system. Both predate every court, every statute, and every commercial tribunal that has since been built over them and presented to the living people as justice.

An administrative tribunal exists to enforce the rules of an administrative system. Its jurisdiction derives from statute. Its purpose is compliance management. Its function is the enforcement of obligations created by the management framework. It does not require a victim. It does not require harm. It does not require consent. It requires only that a rule has been broken.

The question for the living people of New Zealand is this.

Which of these two things are New Zealand courts.

The evidence documented in this report answers that question.

THE EVIDENCE

ONE; NO VICTIM REQUIRED

The majority of matters processed through New Zealand courts involve no victim, no injured living person, no damaged property, no measurable harm to any living man or woman.

Traffic infringements. No victim.
Licensing breaches. No victim.
Regulatory non-compliance. No victim.
Failure to register. No victim.
Failure to pay a fee. No victim.

Under natural law there is no actionable wrong without harm to a living person. The Latin maxim states this precisely.

Ubi nullum damnum ibi nulla actio. Where there is no damage there is no cause of action.

A court that processes cases without a victim is not a court of justice. It is an administrative tribunal enforcing the rules of the management framework it serves. Natural law does not recognise it. The living man or woman standing before it has never consented to its jurisdiction and was never told they could refuse it.

TWO; CONSENT IS NOT REQUIRED

A genuine court of justice derives its jurisdiction from the consent of the living people it serves. Jurisdiction must be established. It cannot be assumed.

New Zealand courts assume jurisdiction over any person who appears before them. The word person is the key. The court does not deal with the living man or woman. It deals with the legal person, the fiction created through birth registration. The living man or woman is presumed to be the legal person unless they clearly and formally rebut that presumption.

When a living man or woman states clearly that they do not consent to the jurisdiction of the court, that they appear by special appearance only, that they are not the legal person named in the proceedings, the court does not engage with that assertion. It proceeds regardless.

A court that proceeds without consent and without engaging with a challenge to its jurisdiction is not a court of justice. It is an administrative tribunal that presumes its own authority.

THREE; THE NAME ON THE CHARGE

In Crown-Richard's case the name on the charge is Powell. Richard Owen. Through six years of forensic research into his primary birth documents Crown-Richard discovered that his registered given name is Richard Owen. Powell appears only in the fields recording the names of his parents in both primary birth documents, the RG9 Notification of Birth Number 4008 completed 3 October 1966 and the RG27 Birth Entry Number 4301 completed 7 October 1966. Richard Owen Powell is not his name. It is a legal fiction created through the registration system by attaching the family surname to the child's given name without the knowledge or consent of the living child or the living man that child became.

The court used the BDM107 Registration Number 1966109132 to identify the living man before it as Richard Owen Powell. The BDM107 states on its own face that it cannot be used as evidence of identity. The court used a document that cannot be used as evidence of identity to assert jurisdiction over a living man by identifying him as a legal fiction created without his knowledge or consent.

FOUR; THE COURT GENERATES REVENUE

The Ministry of Justice generates revenue through court fees regardless of outcome. Filing fees, hearing fees, costs orders, enforcement fees. All flow to a commercially

registered entity. Company Number 300001099 and NZBN 9429041908907.

A court of justice does not generate revenue from the living people it processes. A revenue generating court has a structural incentive toward conviction and compliance rather than toward justice. The commercial framework within which New Zealand courts operate creates precisely this structural incentive.

FIVE; THE CONSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATION IS COMMERCIAL

The entire chain of authority of the New Zealand court system traces back to the Constitution Act 1986, passed without referendum, without the Treaty, deliberately designed not to be superior law, as documented in Chapter Six.

The judges who sit in those courts were appointed through a process internal to the legal establishment. Every judge is a former member of the New Zealand Law Society, an incorporated society under private law. Every judge was trained in the statutory framework that serves the management system.

The court system is a subdivision of the legal fiction registered on the London Stock Exchange under LEI 549300237GPHG2AI7C34. It operates within the commercial management framework. It enforces the rules of that framework. It generates revenue for that framework. It also protects that framework.

THE PAY SYSTEM

The management framework is at its foundation a pay system.

To travel on a public road, pay for a licence, pay for a warrant, pay for registration, pay for fuel excise, pay for road user charges.

To operate a business, pay for registration, pay for GST, pay for PAYE, pay for ACC levies, pay for resource consents.

To own land, pay rates, pay land transfer fees, pay resource consent fees.

To build, pay for a building consent, pay for inspections, pay for code compliance.

To fish, pay for a licence, pay for quota, pay for reporting obligations.

To farm, pay for compliance, pay for environmental reporting, pay for MPI oversight.

To exist as a commercial entity, pay for registration, pay for annual returns, pay for NZBN.

Every activity of the living man or woman in New Zealand requires a payment, a licence, a registration, or a compliance obligation. Every failure to pay, to licence, to register, or to comply generates an infringement, a fine, a prosecution, or a conviction.

The courts process the non-compliant. The fines flow to the Consolidated Fund. The Consolidated Fund services CROWN INC. debt. The CROWN INC. debt is owed to international bondholders holding bonds registered on the London financial markets under LEI 549300237GPHG2AI7C34.

The living man or woman who is fined for travelling without a licence is ultimately contributing to the servicing of bonds held by international investors. They were never told this. The court that fined them did not tell them this. The Police officer who stopped them did not tell them this.

THE ENERGY EXTRACTION SYSTEM

The living man or woman generates energy through their productive labour. That energy is extracted through the following mechanisms.

Income tax. Direct extraction of productive labour through the IRD.

GST. Extraction of fifteen percent of every commercial transaction.

Rates. Extraction from property ownership through local government.

Fines and fees. Extraction through the court and enforcement system.

Licensing and compliance costs. Extraction through the regulatory system.

Mortgage interest. Extraction through the commercial banking system on money created from nothing.

Every mechanism of extraction flows ultimately into the same destination, the servicing of the commercial obligations of the legal fiction registered on the London Stock Exchange under LEI 549300237GPHG2AI7C34 that encompasses the entire machinery of New Zealand government.

The living people are the energy source of the system. Their productive labour is the fuel. The management framework is the extraction mechanism. The courts are the enforcement arm that ensures compliance with the extraction system.

THE PRECISE STATEMENT

New Zealand courts are not courts of justice. They do not operate under natural law. They do not apply natural law. They do not apply tikanga. They are administrative tribunals enforcing the rules of a commercial management framework.

They do not require a victim.

They do not require consent.

They assume jurisdiction over legal fictions.

They generate revenue for a commercially registered entity.

They operate under a constitutional framework deliberately designed without the consent of the living people.

They are subdivisions of a legal fiction registered on the London Stock Exchange under LEI 549300237GPHG2AI7C34.

They perform the appearance of justice. They wear the robes. They use the language. They follow the procedure. But their function is the enforcement of commercial compliance and the extraction of revenue from the living people of this land.

Crown-Richard's case is the precise illustration. No victim. No harm. No damaged property. A living man who stated he did not consent, who provided his real name, who

challenged the jurisdiction of the court. Processed through the administrative tribunal.

This is not justice. It is administration. It is the management framework processing a non-compliant living man through its enforcement and revenue extraction system.

Source. Ministry of Justice Company Number 300001099 NZBN 9429041908907. High Court Fees Regulations 2013. District Court Fees Regulations 2009. Public Finance Act 1989. Senior Courts Act 2016. District Court Act 2016. Lawyers and Conveyancers Act 2006. Constitution Act 1986. Department of Justice Report JL186/41 14 July 1986. Latin maxim Ubi nullum damnum ibi nulla actio. Common law jurisdiction principles. Treasury OIA OIA-20240751.

Sovereign in right of New Zealand LEI: Number; 549300237GPHG2AI7C34.

THE PLAINTIFF IS A FICTION

STAGE ONE; THE ORIGINAL PLAINTIFF

When proceedings are commenced the plaintiff named on the summons is the Ministry for Primary Industries. The Ministry for Primary Industries is a legal person, a body corporate established by statute, existing in law only. It has no flesh, no blood, no breath, and no life. It cannot be harmed, it cannot suffer injury, and it cannot sustain damage to property.

When this is raised before the court and evidence is produced demonstrating that the Ministry for Primary Industries is a registered company the response from the prosecution is immediate and revealing. They do not deny it because they cannot deny it. Instead they pivot, stating that they act for the State.

STAGE TWO; THE STATE AS PLAINTIFF

The prosecution now claims to act for the State. The living man responds with precision by demanding that the prosecution show the injured party, show the damage to property, and identify the living man or woman who has been harmed. These are the foundational requirements of natural law. No offence exists in natural law without an injured party, being a living man or woman who has suffered harm, or damage to property belonging to a living man or woman.

The State cannot be an injured party. The State is not a living man or woman, it cannot suffer harm, and it cannot sustain damage to property. When the prosecution cannot produce an injured party because there is none, and cannot produce evidence of property damage because there is none, they pivot again, stating that they are part of the Crown.

STAGE THREE; THE CROWN AS PLAINTIFF

The prosecution now shelters behind the Crown. The living man responds with precision by demonstrating that the Crown is a corporation. This is not an assertion but a documented fact. The Crown is registered as a legal entity SOVEREIGN IN RIGHT OF

NEW ZEALAND. Therefore, it is CROWN INC., It operates through corporate instruments, enters contracts, holds property, trades in financial instruments, and operates through corporate entities including the Ministry for Primary Industries, the Inland Revenue Department, the Ministry of Social Development, and every other government agency.

A corporation cannot be an injured party under natural law. A corporation has no flesh, no blood, no breath, and no life. A corporation cannot suffer harm in the way a living man or woman suffers harm. Unable to answer this rebuttal the prosecution files a new summons.

STAGE FOUR; ONE LEGAL FICTION VERSUS ANOTHER LEGAL FICTION

The new summons names the plaintiff as The King versus the legal fiction name. This is the most revealing moment in the entire proceeding and it must be examined with precision.

The Ministry for Primary Industries could not sustain its position as plaintiff. The State could not sustain its position as plaintiff. The Sovereign in right of New Zealand CROWN INC. could not sustain its position as plaintiff. Now the King is named as plaintiff.

But who or what is the King in New Zealand law.

The Constitution Act 1986 Section 2 answers this precisely. The head of state of New Zealand is not the King of New Zealand. There is no King of New Zealand. The head of state is described in the Act as the Sovereign in right of New Zealand. That is a legal construct, a constitutional office, a fiction. Its succession is not even determined by New Zealand law. It is determined by the Act of Settlement 1701, an Act of the Parliament of England passed three hundred and fifteen years before the Constitution Act 1986 came into force.

The King named as plaintiff on the summons is not a living man. It is Rex, the Latin designation for the reigning monarch acting in their capacity as a constitutional legal office. It is the Sovereign in right of New Zealand, a corporate constitutional construct sitting at the apex of the commercial management framework. It is not Charles Windsor the living man. It is the office, the legal fiction, the CROWN INC. in its highest form.

When the new summons is examined with this understanding the proceeding is revealed in its precise nature.

One legal fiction versus another legal fiction.

The Sovereign in right of New Zealand, a constitutional legal construct whose succession is determined by an English Act of 1701, versus Richard Owen Powell, a legal fiction created by birth registration on 7 October 1966.

The living man Richard-Owen is present in neither name on that summons. He is not the

plaintiff. He is not the defendant. He is the living man standing in the courtroom who has been presumed without his knowledge or consent to be the legal fiction named as defendant.

The Ministry for Primary Industries could not sustain its position as plaintiff. The State could not sustain its position. The Crown could not sustain its position. And now it is plain why. Every entity that presented itself as plaintiff is a legal fiction. Not one of them is a living man or woman who has suffered harm. The progression ends precisely where it began, with fictions proceeding against fictions, and a living man standing in the middle who was never told what he was looking at.

That presumption can be rebutted. That rebuttal, made clearly and on the record, changes everything.

In documented cases within New Zealand courts living men and women have filed rebuttal documents before the court session commenced, placing the question of jurisdiction on the record prior to any proceeding being heard. The court's response to this is itself revealing. The rebuttal is refused. The jurisdiction argument is not heard. It is not dismissed on its merits. It is simply not entertained.

This occurs whether the living man or woman is represented by a lawyer or stands in self-representation. The reason is precise. A lawyer cannot raise jurisdiction because their licence depends on the court that holds it. A self-represented living man or woman raising jurisdiction is met with the same refusal because the court will not step outside the fictional framework within which it operates.

The court cannot acknowledge the argument without acknowledging the fiction. It will not do either. This refusal is not a legal ruling. It is an administrative response designed to maintain the presumption. And a presumption that cannot be tested, cannot be challenged, and cannot be heard is not justice. It is the appearance of justice conducted entirely within a closed system that protects itself from examination.

This sequence of events has been witnessed in New Zealand courts. It is not theoretical. The progression from government agency to State to CROWN INC. to the Sovereign in right of New Zealand demonstrates precisely what this report has documented from the beginning. Every entity that presents itself as plaintiff is a legal fiction. Not one of them is a living man or woman who has suffered harm.

Source added. Constitution Act 1986 Section 2. Act of Settlement 1701. Imperial Laws Application Act 1988.

THE TRUST MECHANISM; FROM LAND TO LIVING PEOPLE

What has been described above in the courtroom is the visible surface of a deeper structure. To understand why the court operates as it does it is necessary to understand the trust mechanism that underlies the entire system. The courtroom is the enforcement arm of the trust. Understanding the trust explains why the enforcement

operates the way it does.

The land of New Zealand and the living people upon it have been brought within a trust framework that operates through the commercial statutory system. The mechanism by which this was done is documented in the historical record.

The Native Equitable Owners Act 1886 and the legislative framework that preceded and followed it progressively transferred the beneficial interest in the land of New Zealand from the living people to the CROWN INC. The CROWN INC. holds the land not as a sovereign trustee accountable to the living people but as a commercial trustee managing assets for the benefit of the commercial framework.

The Cestui Que Trust framework operates as follows. The CROWN INC. is the trustee. The living people are the beneficiaries in name. The commercial framework is the de facto beneficiary in practice. The living people's beneficial interest is managed on their behalf by the CROWN INC. without their knowledge, without their consent, and without disclosure of the trust's existence or its terms.

The birth registration system documented in Chapter Seven is the mechanism by which each living man and woman is brought within this trust framework individually. When a birth is registered the living man or woman is assigned a fiction. That fiction becomes the trust instrument through which the CROWN INC. manages the living man or woman's participation in the commercial framework. The living man or woman works, earns, pays taxes, pays fines, and services the CROWN INC.'s commercial obligations. All of this flows through the fiction. All of this is managed through the trust. None of it is disclosed. This framework is advanced as a matter of documented research and the author notes it has not been tested before a New Zealand court.

THE FICTION; PARENS PATRIAE; AND THE PRESUMPTION FRAMEWORK

The trust mechanism operates through a series of legal presumptions that are never disclosed to the living man or woman. These presumptions are the mechanism by which the commercial framework maintains its hold over the living people. Understanding them is the first step to addressing them.

The doctrine of Parens Patriae. Latin for parent of the nation, is the legal doctrine under which the state assumes authority over those who cannot manage their own affairs. It was historically applied to children, the mentally incapacitated, and those without legal standing. The commercial framework applies it to the living man or woman through the fiction.

The presumption framework operates through five stages.

STAGE ONE; THE PRESUMPTION OF JOINDER

When a living man or woman responds to the name of the fiction they are presumed to have confirmed joinder. They are presumed to be the fiction. The presumption is never stated. It operates silently through the living man or woman's conduct.

STAGE TWO; THE PRESUMPTION OF CONSENT

When a living man or woman participates in proceedings without objecting to the court's jurisdiction, they are presumed to have consented to that jurisdiction. The presumption is never stated. It operates through participation.

STAGE THREE; THE PRESUMPTION OF COMPETENCE

When a living man or woman engages with the statutory framework without objecting they are presumed to be competent participants in that framework. They are presumed to understand what they are participating in. The presumption is never stated. It operates through engagement.

STAGE FOUR; THE PRESUMPTION OF LIABILITY

When the three preceding presumptions are in place the living man or woman is presumed to be liable for the obligations of the fiction. The fiction's debts become their debts. The fiction's liabilities become their liabilities. The fiction's obligations become their obligations. The presumption is never stated. It is the consequence of the three that precede it.

STAGE FIVE; THE PRESUMPTION OF PARENS PATRIAE

When all four preceding presumptions are in place the state presumes the authority of Parens Patriae over the living man or woman. They are treated as a ward of the state, as a legal infant who cannot manage their own affairs, as a beneficiary of the CROWN INC. trust who must be managed for their own good. The living man or woman who has never been told any of these walks into a court, hears their fiction's name called, steps forward, and in that single act confirms all five presumptions simultaneously.

THE ONLY EXIT

The only exit from the presumption framework is the rebuttal of the presumptions. The living man or woman who understands the framework can rebut each presumption on the record. They can decline to confirm joinder. They can object to jurisdiction. They can place on the record the distinction between themselves and the fiction. They can require the plaintiff to identify a living injured party. They can require the court to establish its jurisdiction over the living man or woman as distinct from its jurisdiction over the fiction.

None of this is easy. The courts are not designed to receive these arguments. The judges are not trained to acknowledge them. The lawyers cannot raise them as documented in Chapter Eleven. The living man or woman who understands the framework and acts on that understanding stand alone in a system that is structurally designed to maintain the presumptions.

But the presumptions can only be maintained with the living man or woman's participation. Without that participation they collapse. The discovery of the fiction is the beginning of sovereignty. The living man or woman who knows what they are looking at can choose whether to confirm the presumptions or rebut them. That choice is the most fundamental exercise of sovereignty available to a living man or woman within the

current system.

THE BORN DOCUMENTS; CONNECTING THE READER TO THE ARGUMENT

Every argument in this report is documented. Every claim is sourced. And the most fundamental claim of all, that there is a distinction between the living man and the fiction created in his name, is not an assertion. It is proven by the government's own documents, four of them, in sequence, each one issued by the New Zealand government, each one held by Crown-Richard, each one exhibited in Appendix One of this report.

THE SEQUENCE OF FOUR DOCUMENTS

THE RG9; NOTIFICATION OF BIRTH; NOTIFICATION NUMBER 4008

The RG9 is the first document in the sequence. It is the notification of birth completed by midwife S.M. Gordon on 3 October 1966 and received by the Registrar of Births Deaths and Marriages Christchurch on 5 October 1966.

The RG9 records one fact above all others. A living male child was born on 3 October 1966 at St Helens Public Hospital Christchurch.

The child has no name on this document. The RG9 records only that a male child was born. The parent is recorded as POWELL Mrs Sally Winsome of 49 Kinsey Terrace Clifton. The child is not named. The child is not Richard Owen Powell. The child is not yet Crown-Richard. The child is a living male human being who came into existence on 3 October 1966. That is all the RG9 records. That is all the RG9 needs to record. It records the biological event.

THE RG27; REGISTRATION OF BIRTH; BIRTH ENTRY NUMBER 4301

The RG27 is the second document in the sequence. It is the registration document. It records not the birth of a living being but the registration of that birth within the CROWN INC.'s administrative system.

The child's name field on the RG27 records. RICHARD OWEN. No middle name. No surname. Powell does not appear in the child's name field. Powell appears only in the name of the father. VICTOR GEORGE POWELL, and the name of the mother. SALLY WINSOME POWELL. The surname Powell belongs to the parents. It was not given to the child at birth. It was not recorded in the child's name field on the registration document.

The Registrar stamped the RG27 on 7 October 1966. That stamp is the precise moment the administrative entry came into existence. The living male child came into existence on 3 October 1966. The administrative entry came into existence on 7 October 1966. They are separated by four days. They are not the same event. They are not the same entity.

The original RG27 certified true copy was witnessed and declared before Deputy Registrar Phil Gane at Christchurch District Court on 31 July 2024 with Crown-Richard as declarant confirming his true name as Richard Owen.

At the bottom of the original RG27 three boxes are ticked. Family Benefit form 1 or 1A issued. Family Benefit form 9 sent, and Notification of Registration RG13. The ticking of the RG13 box confirms that an RG13 was generated at the time of registration on 7 October 1966.

THE RG13; THE MISSING DOCUMENT

The RG13 is the third document in the sequence. It is confirmed to exist by the ticked box on the face of the RG27. It is the document generated at the point of registration on 7 October 1966. It is the document that bridges the notification and the registration. It is the document that would show precisely what information was carried forward from the RG9 and the RG27 into the registration system and what was added or altered in that transfer.

Crown-Richard has requested the RG13 from the Department of Internal Affairs on multiple occasions. It has never been provided.

The Printout Copy which carries Registration Number 1966/109132 and states on its face PRINTOUT COPY ONLY. THIS IS NOT A CERTIFICATE is believed to be a partial extract from the RG13 system. It records the when born date as 5 October 1966. This is not the birth date. The RG9 confirms the birth date as 3 October 1966. The date 5 October 1966 is the date the registrar received the notification. The CROWN INC.'s own administrative system has recorded the wrong date in the when born field of the printout. The original RG27 correctly records 3 October 1966.

The question the withheld RG13 raises is precise. What does the RG13 show that the Department of Internal Affairs does not wish Crown-Richard to see. A document confirmed to exist by the CROWN INC. own records, generated at the moment of registration, formally requested on multiple occasions by the living man whose birth it records, has never been produced.

THE BDM107; THE FICTION'S DOCUMENT; REGISTRATION NUMBER 1966109132

The BDM107 is the fourth document in the sequence. It is the New Zealand Birth Certificate issued under the seal of the Registrar on 26 March 2018.

A warning appears in small print at the bottom of the certificate alongside the legal caution notice. Despite being deliberately minimised in presentation, the Registrar of Births Deaths and Marriages have printed on the face of every New Zealand birth certificate the following statement.

WARNING. This certificate is not evidence of the identity of the person presenting it.

The department that issues the document states on its own document that the document is not evidence of identity. This warning is not prominently displayed. It is buried in small print at the bottom of the page. This placement is itself significant. CROWN INC. knows, states, and then minimises the fact that its own identity document is not evidence of identity.

The BDM107 separates the child's name into two distinct fields.
First given names. Richard Owen
Surname family name. Powell.

The surname Powell does not appear in the child's name field on the RG27. It appears only in the parents' name fields on the RG27. It was added to the child's name at the certificate creation stage. It does not originate from the registration document. It was created at the point the certificate was generated.

The BDM107 records the date of birth as 3 October 1966.

This is the precise fraud documented by the four documents in sequence.

The living male child was born on 3 October 1966. That is confirmed by the RG9.
The administrative entry Crown-Richard was registered on 7 October 1966. That is confirmed by the RG27.
The fiction Richard Owen Powell did not exist on 3 October 1966. The surname Powell was not in the child's name field on the RG27.
The BDM107 takes the living child's birth date of 3 October 1966 and applies it to the fiction Richard Owen Powell as if they are the same entity born on the same day.
They are not. The living child was born on 3 October 1966. The fiction was created on 7 October 1966. The BDM107 conflates two separate events and presents them as one.

That conflation is the mechanism. The living man and the fiction are made to appear identical by applying the living man's birth date to the fiction's creation date. The born documents prove they are not identical. They never were.

THE REGISTRATION NUMBER DISCREPANCY

The BDM107 carries Registration Number 1966109132.
The RG27 printout carries Registration Number 1966/165136.
These are two different numbers for the same registration.
The Crown's administrative system has assigned two different registration numbers to the same birth event.
This discrepancy has never been explained to Crown-Richard.

THE FOUR DAY GAP; THE PROOF OF SEPARATION

The living male child came into existence, 3 October 1966.
The notification was received by the Registrar, 5 October 1966.
The registration was stamped by the Registrar, 7 October 1966.
The fiction Richard Owen Powell came into existence, 7 October 1966.

Four days separate the living man from the fiction. Four days during which the living man existed and the fiction did not. Four days that the BDM107 erases by applying the living man's birth date to the fiction's creation date. Four days that prove they are not the same entity.

This gap exists in the born documents of every living man and woman in New Zealand. Every living man and woman was born before their birth was registered. Every living man and woman existed before the fiction created in their name. The born documents prove it for every one of them.

The born documents of Crown-Richard are exhibited in Appendix One of this report. Every living man and woman reading this report can obtain their equivalent documents from the Department of Internal Affairs and find the same separation in their own records. The process for obtaining those documents is set out in Appendix One.

The courts of New Zealand are administrative tribunals performing as courts of justice. The judges who sit in them are officers of the commercial framework. The fictions that are prosecuted within them are commercial instruments. And the living men and women who appear before them have the right to know what they are walking into.

Source. Ministry of Justice Company Number 300001099 NZBN 9429041908907. High Court Fees Regulations 2013. District Court Fees Regulations 2009. Public Finance Act 1989. Senior Courts Act 2016. District Court Act 2016. Lawyers and Conveyancers Act 2016. Constitution Act 1986. Department of Justice Report JL186/41 14 July 1986. Latin maxim Ubi nullum damnum ibi nulla actio. Common law jurisdiction principles. Treasury OIA OIA-20240751. LEI 549300237GPHG2AI7C34. Native Equitable Owners Act 1886. Cestui Que Trust framework. Parens Patriae doctrine. Ministry for Primary Industries Company Number 300001091 NZBN 9429000096157. New Zealand Business Number Act 2016. Department of Internal Affairs BDM107 issued 19 July 2022. RG9 Notification Number 4008. RG27 Registration Number 1966109132 Birth Entry Number 4301. Born documents of Crown-Richard held personally and exhibited in Appendix One.

The commercial court system does not operate in isolation from the financial system that funds it. Chapter Thirteen documents the Reserve Bank of New Zealand, the currency system, and how the money that flows through every commercial government entity including the courts is created, by whom, on whose authority, and at whose cost.

PART FIVE; THE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK; FROM BIRTH TO DEATH

CHAPTER THIRTEEN; THE REGISTRATION AND IDENTIFIER SYSTEM

Every living man and woman in New Zealand is enrolled in a management framework from the moment of birth. This framework operates through a system of identifiers that progressively enrol the living man or woman in obligations they did not consent to and

cannot opt out of without consequences.

STEP ONE; BIRTH REGISTRATION

The Births Deaths Marriages and Relationships Registration Act 2021 requires the registration of every birth. Registration creates a legal record assigned a registration number. This number is the primary identifier of the legal person, the fiction created through the act of registration. The legal person exists in law. The living man or woman exists in nature. The State deals primarily with the legal person.

The birth certificate states on its face that it cannot be used as evidence of identity. It is a record of a registration event. Yet it is the foundation of the entire identifier framework that follows throughout the life of the living man or woman.

The registration system generates documents at the point of registration that are not made available to the living man or woman whose birth they record. The RG13 is confirmed to exist by the ticked box on the face of the RG27 registration document. It has been requested by Crown-Richard from the Department of Internal Affairs on multiple occasions. It has never been provided. A document confirmed to exist by the Crown's own records, generated at the moment of registration, formally requested on multiple occasions by the living man whose birth it records, has been withheld.

STEP TWO; THE IRD NUMBER

Every person in New Zealand is assigned an IRD number. The identifier through which the Crown's claim on the productive labour of the living people is administered. The Income Tax Act 2007 imposes income tax on every person who derives income. Person in the Act means the legal person, the fiction, not the living man or woman. The living man or woman is reached through the fiction by presumed joinder. The IRD does not ask for consent. It assigns numbers upon registration of the birth certificate. It makes demands. It enforces through penalties, prosecution, and asset seizure.

The IRD's own records contain a confirmed impossibility. In response to OIA request OIA-IRD-2026-002 the IRD stated that Crown-Richard's IRD number was issued on 3 October 1966, the date of birth of the living man. The legal fiction Richard Owen Powell did not exist on 3 October 1966. It came into existence on 7 October 1966 when the Registrar stamped the RG27. The IRD cannot have issued an IRD number to a legal fiction that did not yet exist. The IRD's own records confirm the impossibility. The IRD number was not issued to the living man. It was issued to the fiction. And the fiction did not exist on the date the IRD claims the number was issued.

STEP THREE; THE MSD NUMBER

Every person who interacts with the Ministry of Social Development is assigned an MSD client number. The Social Security Act 2018 imposes compliance obligations on beneficiaries. Compliance is a condition of receiving support. Non-compliance results in sanctions. The living people who need support are enrolled in a compliance

management system as the price of receiving it.

STEP FOUR; FURTHER IDENTIFIERS

As the living man or woman moves through life they are assigned further identifiers each carrying its own obligations.

The driver licence number, monitoring and controlling movement on public roads.

The passport number, controlling international movement.

The ACC client number, managing injury and rehabilitation.

The NHI number, managing health.

The council rates number, through which the local management framework claims its share of the productive capacity of the living people.

Each identifier carries obligations enforced through penalties or loss of privileges for non-compliance.

STEP FIVE; THE ELECTORAL ROLL; DEMOCRACY FOR THE FICTION

The Electoral Act 1993 Section 82 compels the enrolment of every person on the electoral roll. The word person throughout the Electoral Act refers to the legal person, the fiction created through birth registration, not the living man or woman.

The Electoral Commission has confirmed the following in its own official OIA responses.

OIA response 2026/17 dated 23 March 2026. Enrolments have been made without the consent of the living man or woman. Statutory compulsion is the sole basis.

OIA response 2026/17A dated 20 April 2026. No consent mechanism exists or has ever existed.

OIA response 2026/23 dated 29 April 2026. No administrative mechanism exists for removal from the electoral roll. No remedial measures exist. No compensation mechanism exists. No staff training exists on the distinction between the living man or woman and the legal person.

The Electoral Commission further confirmed that enrolments have been made using data accessed from the NZTA driver licence database without the knowledge of the living man or woman. This is a breach of Information Privacy Principle Four of the Privacy Act 2020 which requires that personal information be collected directly from the individual concerned.

The living man or woman who does not consent to having their legal fiction enrolled in the electoral system has no administrative remedy. The only avenue available is High Court judicial review, a commercially administered process requiring filing fees, legal navigation, and judicial approval from a judge appointed through a process internal to the legal establishment.

A living man or woman must therefore obtain the permission of a commercially administered court in order to assert that their living identity is separate from the legal fiction enrolled without their consent. This is not a procedural inconvenience. It is the design of the system made visible.

The electoral roll is not a list of living men and women who have chosen to participate in the democratic process. It is a list of legal fictions enrolled by compulsion without consent, sometimes without knowledge, and with no administrative exit available.

The deeper implication is this.

If the electoral roll is a list of legal fictions.

And Parliament derives its authority from the electoral mandate of those on the electoral roll.

And that electoral roll contains legal fictions enrolled without the consent of the living men and women those fictions represent.

Then Parliament's claimed democratic mandate derives from the participation of legal fictions enrolled without the consent of the living men and women those fictions represent.

Parliament does not govern with the consent of the living people. It governs with the participation of their legal fictions. Participation that was compelled, without consent, without knowledge in some cases, with no exit available.

Source. Electoral Act 1993 Section 82. Electoral Commission OIA response 2026/17 dated 23 March 2026. Electoral Commission OIA response 2026/17A dated 20 April 2026. Electoral Commission OIA response 2026/23 dated 29 April 2026. Privacy Act 2020 Information Privacy Principle Four.

THE THREE PRIMARY COMMERCIAL IDENTIFIERS

The three primary commercial identifiers through which the living man or woman is managed within the CROWN INC.'s financial framework are.

First. The birth certificate registration number. The primary identifier of the legal person.

Second. The IRD number. The identifier through which productive labour is claimed.

Third. The MSD number. The identifier through which welfare dependency is managed.

Together these three identifiers constitute the complete commercial management profile of every living man and woman in New Zealand.

THE ENFORCEMENT CHAIN AND THE REVENUE LOOP

Every constable in New Zealand swears an oath before they exercise a single power over any living man or woman on this land. That oath is recorded in the Policing Act 2008 in these precise words. I swear that I will faithfully and diligently serve His or Her Majesty, King or Queen of New Zealand, his or her heirs and successors. Every soldier in New Zealand swears allegiance in these precise words recorded in the Defence Regulations 1990. I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to our Sovereign Lady the Queen, her heirs and successors. His or her. Our Sovereign Lady. The pronouns of living beings. Not of offices. Not of constructs. Not of registered commercial entities holding Legal Entity Identifier numbers. The pronouns of life. Applied to the living sovereign of this land.

The living sovereign of this land is not a title holder in London. Not a corporation sole that transfers upon death by operation of statute. Not CROWN INC. holding Legal Entity Identifier number 549300237GPHG2AI7C34 registered with the London Stock Exchange Group under a framework established by the G20 Financial Stability Board. The living sovereign is the living men and women who stand upon this land. Who were born of it. Who breathe its air. Who walk its soil. Who carry the living Crown upon their heads by virtue of their existence and not by grant of any parliament or court or commercial registry.

The oaths sworn by every constable and every soldier in New Zealand are sworn to the living sovereign. To the living men and women of this land. To the true Crown. Not to CROWN INC. Not to a registered commercial enforcement chain. Not to a revenue loop funded by levies extracted from the very people being enforced against. To the living sovereign. To us.

When a constable enforces a commercial statute against a living man or woman who has refused joinder with any fiction that constable is not serving the sovereign they swore to serve. They are acting against the sovereign. The living man or woman before them is the sovereign they swore to faithfully and diligently serve. Not a defendant to be processed through a commercial enforcement chain. Not a revenue source to be harvested through pre-set output targets established in a commercial investment programme. The sovereign. Their sovereign. The one they swore the oath to before God and the law of New Zealand.

That oath has never been revoked. It has never been amended to exclude living men and women who stand in their natural state. It stands in full force on the permanent legislative record of this land. And every enforcement action taken against a living man or woman who has refused joinder with any fiction is taken in breach of that oath. By officers who swore before God to serve the living sovereign. And who then proceeded to operate as commercial enforcement agents within a closed revenue loop funded by the very people they swore to serve.

What follows documents that enforcement chain and that revenue loop in full. From their own records. Their own registrations. Their own published investment programmes. Their own commercial identifiers. In their own words.

The management framework is enforced through a chain of commercially registered entities.

Parliament passes legislation creating obligations.
Government departments administer those obligations. Each holding commercial identifiers.

New Zealand Police enforces compliance.
Company Number, 300001205.
NZBN; 9429041909966;
GST Number, 14-290-451. New Zealand Police Infringement Services.
Westpac Bank Account, 03-0049-0000802-27.

Note. New Zealand Police refused to confirm or deny corporation status when asked directly by OIA reference IR-01-24-5821. The stated reason was that confirming or denying would be likely to prejudice the maintenance of the law. No denial was made.

Note. The GST registration of New Zealand Police Infringement Services under the Goods and Services Tax Act 1985 confirms that the infringement system operates as a commercially registered revenue generating function, not purely as a statutory enforcement function.

The commercial nature of Police enforcement is further confirmed by the Road Policing Investment Programme 2024 to 2027. A joint document produced and published by New Zealand Police, NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi, and Te Manatū Waka Ministry of Transport. Three registered corporate entities operating under commercial identifiers on the New Zealand Companies Office register.

The programme commits 1.315 billion dollars to road policing activity over three years and sets the following pre-determined annual output targets.

Passive breath tests, 3,300,000 per year.
Passive breath screening, 2,145,000 per year.
Officer issued speed offences, 430,000 per year.
Officer issued speed offences on open roads, 301,000 per year.
Cell phone offences, 40,000 per year.
Restraint offences, 60,000 per year.
Commercial Vehicle Inspection Reports, 50,000 per year.

These are not public safety outcomes. They are pre-set commercial production targets established in advance and measured annually as outputs of a funded investment programme.

The programme is funded entirely from the National Land Transport Fund. The NLTF is sourced from three commercial levies extracted from living men and women. Fuel excise duty charged on every litre of petrol purchased. Road user charges charged on diesel and heavy vehicles, and motor vehicle registration fees charged annually on every registered vehicle.

The commercial circuit is complete and closed. The living man or woman pays a levy into the National Land Transport Fund. That fund contracts with New Zealand Police to deliver pre-set enforcement output targets. The enforcement generates infringement fees and fines. Those fines flow back into the commercial system. The living man or woman is simultaneously the funding source through the levy, the enforcement target through Police output obligations, and the revenue source through fines and infringement fees.

This is not a public safety programme. It is a closed commercial loop operating against the living people of this land under the appearance of lawful enforcement. It is documented, published, and sourced entirely from the Crown's own records.

Source. Road Policing Investment Programme 2024 to 2027. New Zealand Police, NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi. Te Manatū Waka Ministry of Transport. Published 2024.

The courts process non-compliant living people through the Ministry of Justice. Company Number, 300001099. Generating revenue through filing fees, hearing fees, and costs orders regardless of outcome.

The corrections system manages those convicted, partially through private entities operating for profit under the Corrections Act 2004.

THE REVENUE LOOP

This chain generates revenue at every point.

IRD generates tax revenue from productive labour.

Court proceedings generate filing and hearing fees.

Infringement notices generate fine revenue.

Convictions generate court costs orders.

Imprisonment generates corrections revenue through private operator contracts.

MPI enforcement generates licensing fees, infringement fines, and cost recovery charges.

Council rates generate local government revenue.

GST generates fifteen percent of every commercial transaction.

Electoral enrolment generates the democratic mandate that legitimises the entire framework.

The living people are simultaneously the subjects of governance, the revenue source of the commercial system that governs them, and the source of the democratic mandate the system claims as its authority. All three without their meaningful consent. All three

through the management of their legal fictions. All three beneath the performance of democracy.

**The living people are the collateral. The living people are the revenue.
The living people are the mandate.**

Source, OIA reference IR-01-24-5821, fyi.org.nz, 6 March 2024. Births Deaths Marriages and Relationships Registration Act 2021. Income Tax Act 2007. Social Security Act 2018. Electoral Act 1993. Local Government Act 2002. Corrections Act 2004. Goods and Services Tax Act 1985. OIA-IRD-2026-002. High Court Fees Regulations 2013. District Court Fees Regulations 2009. Senior Courts Act 2016. District Court Act 2016. New Zealand Police Infringement Services GST Number 14-290-451. New Zealand Police Company Number 300001205 NZBN 9429041909966. Ministry of Justice Company Number 300001099.

THE TRUST FRAMEWORK; PARLIAMENT'S OWN WORDS

Beneath the registration and identifier system documented in this chapter lies a legal framework that Parliament itself created, confirmed, and enacted into law. That framework is the trust. Not theory. Not inference. Not argument. Documented in primary legislation passed by the New Zealand Parliament and available on the public record.

The Horowhenua Block Act 1896 named 143 living people directly as cestuis que trustent. That is the legal term for the beneficiaries of a trust. Parliament did not use that term accidentally. Parliament used it because those living people were the beneficiaries of a trust structure created over their land and their estate. Source. Horowhenua Block Act 1896. New Zealand Parliament.

The Land Transfer Act 1915 and the Land Transfer Act 1952 contain provisions that conceal trust arrangements from the public register. A person searching the register would find no evidence of the trust. That was not an oversight. Parliament enacted those provisions deliberately. Source. Land Transfer Act 1915. Land Transfer Act 1952. New Zealand Parliament.

The East Coast Permanent Trustees Limited Act 1962 confirmed that unclaimed living estates held in trust for a period of six years would be absorbed into the Consolidated Fund. The Consolidated Fund is the CROWN INC.'s primary operating account. Estates belonging to living beneficiaries who did not know they were beneficiaries were transferred to the CROWN INC.'s own account by operation of law. Source. East Coast Permanent Trustees Limited Act 1962. New Zealand Parliament.

The Waitangi Endowment Act 1932-33 states in its own Preamble that certain lands were transferred to His Majesty the King in trust for purposes set out in the Act. Section 2 of that Act states the lands shall be held by the Crown upon trust. Section 5 requires the Crown to pay revenue derived from those lands to the named beneficiary after deducting administration expenses. The CROWN INC collecting revenue, deducting its

expenses, and paying the remainder to the beneficiary is textbook trustee behaviour. Source. Waitangi Endowment Act 1932-33. Sections 2 and 5. New Zealand Parliament.

The Waitangi National Trust Board Act 1932 contains the full original Trust Deed signed on 18 November 1932. Clause 13 of that Trust Deed states the lands shall be held upon trust for the people of the Dominion of New Zealand. The people of New Zealand are named as the explicit beneficiaries. The Governor-General signed as trustee. The Prime Minister signed as trustee. Sir Apirana Ngata signed as trustee. Section 11 of that Act states this Act binds the Crown. The CROWN INC. is not above the trust. The CROWN INC is bound by it. Source. Waitangi National Trust Board Act 1932. Clause 13. Section 11. New Zealand Parliament.

These are not isolated examples. They are a pattern. Parliament knows exactly what a trust is. Parliament knows how to create one. Parliament knows how to name beneficiaries. Parliament knows how to conceal that framework from the living people it was built upon. Parliament has done all of these things repeatedly across more than a century of legislation.

The same framework applies to every living man and woman in New Zealand through birth registration. A trust is created at the moment of registration. The living man or woman is the true beneficiary. But the trust presented to the living man and woman through the court system and every administrative proceeding is an inverted one. CROWN INC. has reversed the position entirely. Through legislation, through the court process, through the NAME on every summons and document, the living man or woman has been placed as trustee. As surety. Carrying the liability. Performing the obligation. Paying the debt. While CROWN INC. has silently taken the position of beneficiary. In court this is a constructive trust. The living man or woman is placed there as trustee and surety so CROWN INC. can access the value held in the trust created at birth registration in their NAME. The living people were never told they were the true beneficiary. They were never told a trust existed. They were never told their position had been inverted. Unlike the Waitangi Trust where the beneficiaries were named and told, the living man and woman were never informed. The trust was concealed from the public register by the very Acts Parliament passed to govern it. Parliament has legislated in at least one documented instance for unclaimed trust estates to flow directly into the Consolidated Fund, CROWN INC.'s primary operating account. Whether that same mechanism applies to birth trust estates has never been disclosed to the living people whose registrations created those estates. That absence of disclosure is not an oversight. It is a pattern. And the pattern is documented entirely from Parliament's own legislation across more than a century.

Parliament's own words. Parliament's own Acts. Parliament's own signatures. Their own admission.

The primary legislation documenting this framework is available for examination at livingsovereign.org.

The management framework documented in this chapter operates through identifiers, obligations, and enforcement. But beneath the identifier system lies a deeper framework, the monetary system through which the productive labour of the living people is converted into revenue for CROWN INC. and profit for the commercial banking system. Chapter Fourteen examines how money is created, how debt is structured, and why no bank in New Zealand can produce a true and lawful receipt for a mortgage loan.

PART SIX; THE MONETARY FRAMEWORK

CHAPTER FOURTEEN; MONEY CREATION AND THE DEBT FRAMEWORK

The Reserve Bank of New Zealand in its published material has confirmed that commercial banks create money through the act of lending. When a bank makes a loan it creates a new deposit in the borrower's account, new money that did not previously exist. It is not lent from pre-existing deposits. This is confirmed by the Bank of England in its 2014 quarterly bulletin titled Money Creation in the Modern Economy.

When a living man or woman takes a mortgage from Westpac or any other commercial bank the following occurs.

The living man or woman signs a promissory note. The bank creates the loan amount as a new deposit, money that did not exist before the signing.

The living man or woman repays the principal plus interest from their productive labour over twenty five or thirty years.

The bank created the principal from nothing.

The interest represents a permanent transfer of productive labour from the living person to the banking system.

The living people of this land repay in real labour and real assets money that was created from nothing. They were never told this is how the system operates. It is confirmed in the Reserve Bank's own publications.

The CROWN INC. issues bonds on international capital markets purchased by international investors. The CROWN INC. receives the bond proceeds and uses them to fund government operations. The IRD then collects tax from the productive labour of the living people to service the interest and principal on those bonds. The living people repay with their labour bonds that were issued without their knowledge or consent, confirmed by Treasury OIA OIA-20240751.

The mechanics of this process when examined under the law of negotiable instruments reveal a fatal defect in the bank's position that applies to every mortgage in New Zealand.

THE BANK'S FATAL DEFECT; MONEY CREATION AND THE ABSENCE OF A LAWFUL RECEIPT

To understand why no bank in New Zealand can lawfully foreclose a mortgage it is necessary to first understand precisely how a mortgage loan comes into existence. When a living man or woman signs a mortgage agreement they sign a promissory note. That promissory note is a negotiable instrument. It is a promise to pay. The bank takes that signed promissory note and records it on its balance sheet as an asset. Simultaneously the bank credits the borrower's account with the loan amount. No money is transferred from the bank's existing funds. No depositor's savings are lent. The money that appears in the borrower's account is created at the moment of signing by the borrower's own signature. The bank did not have that money before the signature. The signature created it. This is not a conspiracy theory. It is standard double entry bookkeeping confirmed by central banks worldwide including the Bank of England in its quarterly bulletin of 2014 which stated in precise terms that the majority of money in the modern economy is created by commercial banks making loans.

In New Zealand the Reserve Bank of New Zealand Act 1989 governs the monetary system. The Reserve Bank itself acknowledges that registered banks create money through the lending process. The bank receives the borrower's promissory note, records it as an asset worth the full loan amount, and simultaneously creates a liability in the form of the credited funds. The bank has exchanged nothing of its own. It has provided nothing from its own existing resources. It has created a bookkeeping entry and secured that entry against the living man or woman's property.

This creates a fundamental and fatal defect in every mortgage foreclosure proceeding in New Zealand. The Credit Contracts and Consumer Finance Act 2003 requires full and accurate disclosure of the true nature of the credit contract. It requires the lender to disclose the total amount of credit, the interest rate, and all fees and charges. What it does not require, and what no bank has ever voluntarily disclosed, is the source of the funds advanced. No bank discloses that the money lent was created by the borrower's own signature. No bank provides a receipt showing that it transferred existing funds of value from its own resources to the borrower. Because no such transfer occurred. Because no such funds existed before the signature.

A receipt is evidence of a transaction in which one party provided something of value to another. For a receipt to be true and lawful it must accurately record what was given, by whom, and in exchange for what. A bank that creates money from the borrower's own signature and then charges interest on that creation for the lifetime of the loan cannot provide a true and lawful receipt because the transaction it would need to receipt never occurred in the way it is represented. The bank provided no pre-existing money. The bank transferred no existing asset. The bank created a bookkeeping entry and called it a loan.

The Property Law Act 2007 governs mortgagee sales in New Zealand. Sections 119 and 120 require notice to be given before a mortgagee exercises power of sale. Section 187 governs sale through the Registrar or through the court. The Act assumes throughout

that the mortgagee is a creditor who advanced genuine value and is entitled to recover that value from the security. But if the bank advanced no genuine pre-existing value, if the money was created from the borrower's own signature, then the foundational assumption of the entire mortgagee sale process is false. The bank is not a creditor in the true and lawful sense. It is an administrator of a bookkeeping entry secured against real property.

The consequence of this analysis is precise. When a bank or a local council attempt to foreclose a mortgage or enforce a debt secured against property, the living man or woman is entitled to require the bank manager or the authorised officer of that institution to appear before the court and produce the true and lawful receipt for the property. Not a certificate of debt. Not a computer printout. Not an affidavit from a records officer. Not a document that may appear to be a receipt when in fact it is not. A true and lawful receipt must show that the institution transferred pre-existing funds of genuine value to the borrower at the time the mortgage was created. That receipt does not exist. It cannot exist. Because the transaction it would need to evidence never occurred. And a foreclosure proceeding built on a transaction that cannot be evidenced by a true and lawful receipt is not a lawful proceeding. It is a commercial enforcement action by a corporation that created money from nothing, charged interest on that creation for decades, and now seeks to take real property from a living man or woman as remedy for a debt that was never genuinely owed in the first place.

Source. Knowles J. Austin L. Kerr L. Money creation in New Zealand. Reserve Bank of New Zealand Bulletin. Volume 86 Number 1, 31 January 2023, [rbnz.govt.nz](https://www.rbnz.govt.nz). Bank of England Quarterly Bulletin 2014 Q1. Money Creation in the Modern Economy. McLeay. Radia and Thomas. Reserve Bank of New Zealand Act 1989. Credit Contracts and Consumer Finance Act 2003. Property Law Act 2007 Sections 119, 120, and 187. Treasury OIA OIA-20240751.

PART SEVEN; THE CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS STATED

CHAPTER FIFTEEN; MANAGEMENT WITHOUT CONSENT; A SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This report has documented the following findings from primary sources. Each finding is sourced. Each is verifiable. Each is drawn from the Crown Inc own records.

FINDING ONE; FOUNDATIONAL ILLEGITIMACY

The CROWN INC. claimed jurisdiction over this land by Letters Patent on 15 June 1839 before the Treaty of Waitangi was signed. The Treaty exists in two irreconcilable texts. The Maori text did not cede sovereignty. The Waitangi Tribunal confirmed this in Wai 1040. The constitutional foundation of Crown authority is contested at its very origin.

Source. Letters Patent 15 June 1839. Treaty of Waitangi 1840. Waitangi Tribunal Wai 1040 2014.

FINDING TWO; PROGRESSIVE DISPOSSESSION WITHOUT CONSENT

From 1852 to the present day the living people of this land have been progressively dispossessed of their land, their knowledge, their cultural practices, their constitutional protections, and their inherent sovereign rights through legislation passed without their consent. The Native Land Court converted communal sovereign land into purchasable individual titles. The Tohunga Suppression Act criminalised living knowledge for fifty-five years. The abolition of the Legislative Council removed the constitutional check on parliamentary power. The Constitution Act 1986 excluded the Treaty, removed Section 71 protection, deliberately avoided superior law status, and confirmed unlimited parliamentary power, all without a referendum, all on the recommendation of the CROWN INC.'s own Department of Justice.

Source. Native Lands Acts 1862 and 1865. Tohunga Suppression Act 1907. Legislative Council Abolition Act 1950. Constitution Act 1986. Department of Justice Report JL186/41, 14 July 1986.

FINDING THREE; THE CROWN INC. IS A LEGAL FICTION WITH ABSOLUTE POWER

The entity named in the Constitution Act 1986 as the Sovereign in right of New Zealand is defined in the State-Owned Enterprises Act 1986 as the Crown. That Crown, operating as CROWN INC., is by its own admission a legal personification, a legal fiction. It exercises absolute power over the living people. It can pass any law, tax any income, compel any enrolment, seize any property, detain any living man or woman. No court can strike down its legislation. No constitutional instrument limits its power. This absolute power was deliberately constructed on the recommendation of CROWN INC.'s own Department of Justice in its official report of 14 July 1986.

Source, DPMC official description, dpmc.govt.nz. Constitution Act 1986. Department of Justice Report JL186/41, 14 July 1986.

FINDING FOUR; GOVERNMENT IS CORPORATISED

Government departments and CROWN INC. entities hold commercial identifiers. They operate as commercial participants generating revenue from the living people they govern. That revenue flows through foreign owned commercial bank accounts into the CROWN INC.'s financial management system.

The Sovereign in Right of New Zealand. Previously registered on SEC EDGAR under CIK 0000216105 under the name HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF NEW ZEALAND, SIC code 8888 FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS, prior to 2013. Current listing London Stock Exchange. LEI 549300237GPHG2AI7C34. THE SOVEREIGN IN RIGHT OF NEW ZEALAND. Legal Form GOVERNMENT. Registered Address C/O THE TREASURY. PO BOX 3724. Wellington Central. WELLINGTON. New Zealand, confirmed by Treasury OIA OIA-20240751 and OpenLEIs.com.

New Zealand Police. Company Number 300001205. NZBN 9429041909966, GST Number 14-290-451. New Zealand Police Infringement Services. Westpac accounts

confirmed. D-U-N-S Number 590216123. Refused to confirm or deny corporation status when asked directly by OIA.

Ministry for Primary Industries. Company Number 300001091. NZBN 9429000096157, GST Number 64-558-838. Westpac NZ Government Branch Wellington Account 03-0049-0001709-002.

Ministry of Justice. Company Number 300001099.

Source, OIA reference IR-01-24-5821, fyi.org.nz, 6 March 2024. Public records confirmed by Crown-Richard. Treasury OIA OIA-20240751. SEC EDGAR database, sec.gov.

These identifiers do not exist in isolation. GST registration, NZBN numbers, DUNS numbers and bank accounts each confirm participation in commercial and administrative systems. A sovereign government acting purely in public law capacity does not require a GST number, a commercial data identifier or a transactional bank account routed through a foreign owned private bank. The presence of these identifiers across every major Crown agency confirms what the Companies Register data and the SEC registration already show. These entities operate in commerce. They collect revenue. They hold accounts. They participate in international commercial databases. That is not the behaviour of a purely sovereign public authority. That is the behaviour of a commercial operation using sovereign language as its enforcement mechanism.

FINDING FIVE; THE COMMERCIAL REGISTRATIONS ARE HIDDEN FROM THE LIVING PEOPLE

Government entity registration data that appears in Companienz.com sourcing directly from the New Zealand Companies Office does not appear in public searches of the official Companies Register at companies.govt.nz. The living people who are subject to enforcement by these entities cannot access through the official register the commercial registration details of the entities enforcing against them. When asked directly by OIA to confirm or deny corporation status New Zealand Police refused, stating that confirming or denying would prejudice the maintenance of the law. No denial was made.

Source. Companienz.com landing page and search results, companies.govt.nz search results, OIA reference IR-01-24-5821, fyi.org.nz, 6 March 2024.

An OIA request to the Companies Office asking why this discrepancy exists has not received a substantive response. The discrepancy remains unexplained. A further Official Information Act request has been filed with the Companies Office Registrar seeking the underlying registration data, record type, field label, creation date and legal basis for each number. The request seeks confirmation of whether each number represents a Companies Act incorporation, a state sector entity number, an NZBN related record or another administrative identifier. The response will be published as a supplementary exhibit to this report when received.

FINDING SIX; THE JUDICIARY IS A COMMERCIAL OPERATION

The court system is administered by the Ministry of Justice generating revenue through court fees regardless of outcome. Judges are appointed through a process internal to the legal establishment. Every judge is a former member of the New Zealand Law Society, an incorporated society under private law that self-regulates. The chain of authority of the entire legal system traces back to the Constitution Act 1986, passed without referendum, without the Treaty, and deliberately designed not to be superior law.

Source. Senior Courts Act 2016. District Court Act 2016. Lawyers and Conveyancers Act 2006. High Court Fees Regulations 2013. District Court Fees Regulations 2009. Constitution Act 1986.

FINDING SEVEN; THE ELECTORAL SYSTEM IS DESIGNED FOR THE FICTION

The electoral roll is a list of legal fictions enrolled by compulsion without consent, sometimes without knowledge, using data accessed from government databases without authorisation, with no administrative exit available to the living man or woman who does not consent. Parliament's claimed democratic mandate derives from the participation of legal fictions enrolled without the consent of the living men and women those fictions represent. Parliament does not govern with the consent of the living people. It governs with the participation of their legal fictions.

Source. Electoral Act 1993 Section 82. Electoral Commission OIA responses 2026/17, 2026/17A, 2026/23. Privacy Act 2020 Information Privacy Principle Four.

FINDING EIGHT; THE LIVING PEOPLE ARE THE COLLATERAL

The productive capacity of the living people backs the bonds listed on the London Stock Exchange. Their labour services the interest and principal. Their taxes fund the management framework. Their compliance generates revenue for the commercially registered entities that enforce against them. Their legal fictions provide the democratic mandate that legitimises the system.

The living people are the collateral.

The living people are the revenue.

The living people are the mandate.

All without their meaningful consent.

FINDING NINE; THE SEPARATE LEGAL PERSON CONFIRMED

The principle that a registered entity is a legal person separate and distinct from the living men and women behind it was confirmed by the House of Lords in *Salomon v Salomon and Company Limited* 1897 AC 22. The House of Lords held unanimously that a registered company has a legal existence entirely separate from its members, its

officers, and its founders. It has its own rights, its own liabilities, and its own legal identity distinct from any living man or woman.

This principle applies without exception to every entity documented in this report.

New Zealand Police. Company Number 300001205, is by the principle confirmed in Salomon v Salomon a legal person separate and distinct from the living men and women who serve as its officers.

The Ministry for Primary Industries. Company Number 300001091, is a legal person separate and distinct from the living men and women who administer it.

The Sovereign in Right of New Zealand. LEI 549300237GPHG2AI7C34, previously registered on SEC EDGAR under CIK 0000216105, is a legal person separate and distinct from the living people it claims to govern.

When a legal person enforces against a living man or woman it does so as a commercial entity, not as a sovereign authority. The enforcement chain documented in this report is not the sovereign authority of the living people acting upon itself. It is one legal person acting upon living men and women who never consented to be subject to its commercial jurisdiction.

Salomon v Salomon does not merely support the findings of this report. It confirms them from the highest authority of the common law.

Source. Salomon v Salomon and Company Limited 1897 AC 22. House of Lords.

Source. Treasury OIA OIA-20240751. Reserve Bank of New Zealand publications. Income Tax Act 2007. Electoral Commission OIA responses 2026/17, 2026/17A, 2026/23.

These nine findings are drawn entirely from primary sources. Every finding is documented. Every finding is verifiable. Every finding is confirmed by the Crown's own records, official registers, official OIA responses, and official legislative history. The system documented in this report was not built by accident. It was built by design. Chapter Sixteen names it precisely.

FINDING TEN; THE IRD IMPOSSIBILITY

The IRD number is attached to the legal fiction RICHARD OWEN POWELL.

An IRD number exists in the name of the legal fiction. No application for that number can be produced, IRD confirmed in OIA response 27OIA1128 dated 31 August 2026 that it does not hold the original application or supporting records and cannot establish who applied for the number, IRD further confirmed that no legislative authority existed in 1966 for a father or mother to apply on behalf of a child, that the IRD number system did not exist until 1975, and that no information sharing agreement with Births Deaths and Marriages existed until 2013.

An IRD number was issued. No one applied for it. No authority existed to create it. No consent was obtained. No record exists of how it came to exist.

When portions of the Information Matching Agreements were requested IRD withheld significant sections under section 18(c)(i) of the Official Information Act 1982 on the grounds that release would adversely affect the integrity of the tax system or prejudice the maintenance of the law.

This is the same withholding ground used by New Zealand Police when asked by OIA reference IR-01-24-5821 to confirm or deny their corporation status. The same ground. The same refusal. The same pattern.

Source, OIA response 27OIA1128. Inland Revenue, 31 August 2026.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN; WHAT THIS SYSTEM ACTUALLY IS; THE FOUR CONFIRMED ELEMENTS

A dictatorship is a system of governance in which absolute power is exercised without the meaningful consent of the governed, without constitutional limits on that power, and without genuine accountability to those over whom the power is exercised. The management framework documented in this report meets every element of that definition.

ABSOLUTE POWER; DOCUMENTED

Parliament can pass any law. No court can strike it down. No constitutional instrument limits it. The Treaty has no supreme law status. The living people have no constitutional protection against parliamentary action beyond a general election every three years. This absolute power was deliberately constructed. The Department of Justice recommended it. The Parliament of 1986 enacted it.

WITHOUT CONSENT; DOCUMENTED

The constitutional framework was established without referendum. The Treaty was deliberately excluded. The upper house was abolished without a referendum. The management framework of identifiers and obligations was constructed without the consent of the living people. The bonds on international capital markets were issued without the knowledge or consent of the living people whose labour services them. At no point in the construction of the management framework documented in this report were the living people of this land asked for their consent.

WITHOUT CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITS; DOCUMENTED

The Constitution Act 1986 places no limits on parliamentary power. Parliament can amend the Constitution Act itself by simple majority. There is no entrenched constitutional protection for the inherent rights of the living people. This was deliberate, recommended by the Department of Justice, implemented by Parliament, documented

in the official record.

WITHOUT GENUINE ACCOUNTABILITY; DOCUMENTED

The management framework continues regardless of which party holds power. The commercial registrations of government entities are not publicly searchable. The CROWN INC. financial participation in international capital markets was not disclosed to the living people. The judiciary is appointed through a process internal to the legal establishment. The legal profession regulates itself. The Police refused to confirm or deny their own corporate status when asked directly.

THE DIFFERENCE FROM AN OVERT DICTATORSHIP

An overt dictatorship announces itself. It does not hold elections. It does not maintain a parliament. It does not pretend to serve the living people.

The hidden dictatorship documented in this report is more sophisticated. It holds elections every three years. It maintains a parliament. It has a judiciary. It has a bill of rights. It performs the theatre of democracy with considerable skill.

But beneath the theatre the management framework operates continuously. The commercial registrations remain. The bonds continue to be serviced from the productive labour of the living people. The identifier and obligation system continues to enroll the living people from birth. The enforcement chain continues to process non-compliant living people through a commercially administered court system. The electoral system continues to enrol legal fictions and claim their participation as democratic consent.

The performance of democracy is the mechanism through which the hidden dictatorship maintains the appearance of consent. The living people believe they are participating in their own governance. They are participating in the management of their own compliance.

This is not hidden in the sense that the evidence is secret. The evidence is in the CROWN INC. own records, in its own OIA responses, in its own SEC filings, in its own departmental reports, in its own commercial registrations, in its own Electoral Commission admissions.

It is hidden in the sense that it has never been presented to the living people of this land in a way that makes its nature and its significance clear.

This report makes it clear.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN; CONCLUSION; THE RECORD SPEAKS FOR ITSELF

This report has relied entirely on.

The Crown's own official descriptions of itself.

The Crown's own commercial registrations.

The CROWN INC.'s own OIA responses.

The CROWN INC.'s own parliamentary record.

The CROWN INC.'s own SEC filings.

The CROWN INC.'s own departmental reports signed by its own Secretary for Justice.

The findings of the CROWN INC.'s own statutory tribunal.

The CROWN INC.'s own legislation.

The CROWN INC.'s own court fee regulations.

The CROWN INC.'s own Reserve Bank publications.

The CROWN INC.'s own Electoral Commission admissions.

The CROWN INC. has documented its own system from its own mouth and its own records. This report has assembled that documentation and presented it to the living people of this land in a single coherent account.

The living people of this land did not create this system. It was created for them over generations through legislation passed without their consent, through constitutional changes made without their knowledge, through commercial registrations made without their awareness, through bonds issued on foreign capital markets without their knowledge or agreement, through electoral enrolments made without their consent using data accessed without their knowledge.

The living people of this land are born into a management framework they did not consent to, assigned identifiers they did not request, enrolled in obligations they did not agree to, subject to enforcement by commercially registered entities they did not appoint, processed through courts they do not control, servicing with their labour bonds they did not authorise, providing through their legal fictions a democratic mandate they did not meaningfully give.

This is the constitutional crisis of New Zealand. It is documented. It is evidenced. It is real.

The record speaks for itself.

CLOSING STATEMENT

TO THE LIVING PEOPLE OF NEW ZEALAND

Before the first government was formed, before the first statute was written, before the first registration was made, you existed. You came into this world through your mother, connected to this earth and to this land. You arrived breathing, feeling, alive. And in that moment, before any system could reach you, before any fiction could be attached to

you, you were complete. You were whole. You were sovereign.

The record documented in this report does not change that. It only makes clear what has been built around you without your consent, and without your knowledge.

Natural law predates every statute on the New Zealand parliamentary record. Natural law predates the Constitution Act 1986 by hundreds of years. He Whakaputanga declared the sovereign authority of the living people of this land in 1835 and has never been repealed. A legal fiction cannot extinguish the natural law rights of a living being. It can only obscure them, manage them, and hope that the living people forget they have them.

We have not forgotten.

The solution is built on three foundations.

FOUNDATION ONE; SOVEREIGN STANDING

Every living man and woman of this land has inherent sovereign standing. It was not granted by parliament and cannot be removed by parliament. It derives from natural law, Tikanga, and He Whakaputanga 1835. Claiming sovereign standing is not a legal argument to be won or lost in a commercial court. It is a statement of fact.

FOUNDATION TWO; SOVEREIGN COMMUNITY

Sovereign standing claimed within a community of living men and women who recognise each other's sovereignty is transformative. The management framework relies on the isolation of the living people. It processes them individually, assigns them individual numbers, enforces against them individually. A sovereign community that recognises each other's standing, trades in sovereign exchange, resolves disputes through natural law and tikanga, and supports each other through sovereign institutions operates outside the reach of the management framework.

FOUNDATION THREE; SOVEREIGN INSTITUTIONS

Sovereign standing and sovereign community require sovereign institutions to give them practical expression.

A sovereign exchange economy backed by real assets rather than credit created from nothing.

A sovereign education framework that teaches the real history of this land and the real nature of the management framework.

A sovereign justice framework that resolves disputes through natural law and tikanga.

A sovereign infrastructure network of physical hubs and vault storage.

Sovereign relationships with hapu and iwi that honour the tino rangatiratanga of the living people under He Whakaputanga and the Treaty.

These institutions do not require parliamentary approval. They do not require registration under the Companies Act 1993. They do not require NZBNs or GST numbers or bank accounts with Australian owned banks. They require only the commitment of living men and women who understand what is at stake and choose to build something worthy of the land they stand on and the children they are responsible for.

Our children are born into this framework, assigned numbers before they can speak, enrolled in obligations before they can work, managed rather than served for the entirety of their lives. They deserve better. Every living man and woman of this land deserves better.

The time for change is not tomorrow. It is now. It is for our children. It is for their children. It is for every living man and woman of this land who deserves to live in the fullness of their inherent sovereignty.

The record speaks for itself. Now so must we.

THE OWEN REPORT

NEW ZEALAND'S MANAGEMENT WITHOUT INFORMED CONSENT

FROM THE WHAKAPUTANGA 1835 TO THE PRESENT DAY; DOCUMENTED FROM
PRIMARY SOURCES

Prepared by: Crown-Richard

WHAT COMES NEXT.

This report is the beginning. Not the end.

The Living Sovereign Research Association is building something significant for all living men and women of New Zealand. Your support today funds and supports what is coming.

WHAT YOUR SUPPORT MAKES POSSIBLE.

NATIONAL TRUST FRAMEWORK. A trust framework being developed for the benefit of every living man and woman of this land. Members will be the first beneficiaries.

RESEARCH ASSISTANCE. Future consultations and research support for living men and women navigating legal and administrative matters in development.

UNITY ACROSS THE LAND. Building connection between all living men and women of New Zealand regardless of background. This land belongs to all who stand on it in truth. We are committed to generational wellbeing for the people, the land, the air, and the water. What we build today is for those not yet born.

These projects are in development. Your membership and support makes them possible.

HOW TO SUPPORT THIS WORK.

ONE. PURCHASE THE OWEN REPORT. The Owen Report is available for \$40. Every purchase directly funds this research and the work ahead. Purchase at livingsovereign.org.

TWO. BECOME A MEMBER. Join the Living Sovereign Research Association and be part of what is being built. Membership details at livingsovereign.org. The Owen Report \$30 with Membership.

THREE. SHARE THE WEBSITE. Share livingsovereign.org with every living man and woman you know.

FOUR. SHARE THE FACEBOOK PAGE. Share our Facebook group with everyone you know, facebook.com/groups/1422645139710131.

FIND US HERE.

Website, livingsovereign.org.

Email, office@livingsovereign.org.

Facebook, facebook.com/groups/1422645139710131.

THE LAND REMEMBERS.

The CROWN INC. registered the land. The CROWN INC. registered the people. The CROWN INC. registered the money. The CROWN INC. registered everything. But it cannot register the truth. The truth is what this report contains. And the truth belongs to the living.

THREE PRACTICAL ACTS EVERY LIVING MAN AND WOMAN CAN TAKE TODAY.

The report you have just read is documented from primary sources. Every Act cited is available on the public record. Every company number is verifiable. Every OIA response is filed. The system is not hidden. It is simply not explained. These three acts cost nothing and require no lawyer and no court.

ONE; OBTAIN YOUR BORN DOCUMENTS;

Contact the Department of Internal Affairs. Request your RG9, your RG27, and your BDM107. These are the documents generated at the moment of your birth registration. They record the creation of the legal fiction, the separation between the living man or woman and the registered entity. The RG13 has been confirmed to exist by the CROWN INC. own records. Request it also. It may be withheld as it has been withheld from Crown-Richard on multiple occasions. That refusal is itself a confirmation. A document confirmed to exist, generated at the moment of your registration, withheld from the living man or woman whose birth it records. Request them. Document the response. Keep the record.

TWO; KNOW YOUR TRUE NAME;

Your true name is the name given to you by your father and your mother. Not the registered fiction. Not the entity on the birth certificate. Not the surname first in all caps on your driver's License. The living man Crown-Richard, known by his true name Richard Owen, is not the legal fiction RICHARD OWEN POWELL created by birth registration on 7 October 1966. They are not the same. One is a living man. The other is a registered commercial entity. Know which one you are. Know which name belongs to the living man or woman. Your born documents prove the separation. Your father and your mother named you. The State registered a fiction. Those are two different things.

THREE; VISIT LIVINGSOVEREIGN.ORG;

The primary legislation is there. The Acts of Parliament naming the living people as cestuis que trustent are there. The Waitangi National Trust Board Act 1932 naming the people of New Zealand as explicit beneficiaries is there. The Imperial Laws Application Act 1988 confirming Magna Carta, the Petition of Right, and the Bill of Rights as operative in New Zealand today is there. Read them. Share them. The truth belongs to the living and the living deserve to know it.

Join Us and let's make a real difference;

APPENDIX ONE; PRIMARY SOURCES AND REFERENCES

He Whakaputanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tireni, 28 October 1835. Archives New Zealand reference IA 9/9.

Reply of King William IV acknowledging He Whakaputanga, 2 March 1836.

Letters Patent incorporating New Zealand into New South Wales, 15 June 1839. Archives New Zealand.

Treaty of Waitangi, 6 February 1840. Archives New Zealand.

Waitangi Tribunal Te Paparahi o te Raki Inquiry Stage One Report 2014. Wai 1040.

New Zealand Constitution Act 1852. Westminster Parliament. Section 71.

Attorney General Henry Sewell. Parliamentary Debates 1865. Native Land Court purpose statement.

Native Lands Act 1862. New Zealand Parliament.

Native Lands Act 1865. New Zealand Parliament.

Tohunga Suppression Act 1907. New Zealand Parliament.

Tohunga Suppression Act Repeal Act 1962. New Zealand Parliament.

Social Security Act 1938. New Zealand Parliament.

Legislative Council Abolition Act 1950. New Zealand Parliament.

Kumarasingham H. New Zealand Legislative Council abolition. Australasian Parliamentary Review. November 2010.

Accident Compensation Act 1972. New Zealand Parliament.

Constitution Act 1986. New Zealand Parliament.

Department of Justice Report to the Justice and Law Reform Committee. Constitution Bill, 14 July 1986. Reference JL186/41. Signed by the Secretary for Justice.

PRIMARY SOURCE DOCUMENT. Full details and significance documented at livingsovereign.org. **Evidence. Crown Sovereign in Right of New Zealand.**

State Owned Enterprises Act 1986. New Zealand Parliament.

Goods and Services Tax Act 1985. New Zealand Parliament.

Resource Management Act 1991. New Zealand Parliament.

Electoral Act 1993. New Zealand Parliament. Section 82.

Oranga Tamariki Act 1989. New Zealand Parliament.

Crown Entities Act 2004. New Zealand Parliament.

Corrections Act 2004. New Zealand Parliament.

Lawyers and Conveyancers Act 2006. New Zealand Parliament.

Income Tax Act 2007. New Zealand Parliament.

Immigration Act 2009. New Zealand Parliament.

Attorney General Act 2009. New Zealand Parliament.

Local Government Act 2002. New Zealand Parliament.

Senior Courts Act 2016. New Zealand Parliament.

District Court Act 2016. New Zealand Parliament.

New Zealand Business Number Act 2016. New Zealand Parliament.

Social Security Act 2018. New Zealand Parliament.

Privacy Act 2020. New Zealand Parliament. Information Privacy Principle Four.

Reserve Bank of New Zealand Act 2021. New Zealand Parliament.

Births Deaths Marriages and Relationships Registration Act 2021. New Zealand Parliament.

High Court Fees Regulations 2013.

District Court Fees Regulations 2009.

New Zealand Treasury OIA response. Reference OIA-20240751. November 2024. Confirming SEC registration, three SEC filings in 2008, and bond registration. Current listing London Stock Exchange under LEI 549300237GPHG2AI7C34.

SEC EDGAR database. Her Majesty the Queen in Right of New Zealand. CIK 0000216105, SIC Code 8888. Foreign Governments. Accessible at sec.gov.

Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. Official description of the Crown in Right of New Zealand. Accessible at dpmc.govt.nz.

New Zealand Police OIA response. Reference IR-01-24-5821, 6 March 2024. Documented at fyi.org.nz. Confirming Company Number 300001205. NZBN 9429041909966. D-U-N-S Number 590216123. Refusal to confirm or deny corporation status.

Electoral Commission OIA response. Reference 2026/23, 29 April 2026. Confirming no administrative removal mechanism exists, no remedial measures, no compensation mechanism, no staff training on the distinction between the living man or woman and the legal person, no consent obtained for originating enrolments.

Electoral Commission OIA response. Reference 2026/17A, 20 April 2026. Confirming no consent mechanism exists or has ever existed.

Reserve Bank of New Zealand. Educational publications on money creation. Accessible at rbnz.govt.nz.

Bank of England. Money Creation in the Modern Economy. Quarterly Bulletin 2014 Q1. Accessible at bankofengland.co.uk.

Companienz.com. Landing page statement confirming data sourced directly from New Zealand Companies Office. Search results for Ministry for Primary Industries and New Zealand Police. Accessible at companienz.com.

companies.govt.nz. Official New Zealand Companies Register. Absence of search results for Ministry for Primary Industries and New Zealand Police. Accessible at companies.govt.nz.

Australian Banking Act 1959. Australian Parliament.

Westpac Banking Corporation. Annual Report. Confirming Australian incorporation and Australian Securities Exchange listing.

APPENDIX TWO; VERIFIED COMMERCIAL IDENTIFIERS OF KEY ENTITIES

THE SOVEREIGN IN RIGHT OF NEW ZEALAND

Former name. Her Majesty the Queen in Right of New Zealand.

LEI Number, 549300237GPHG2AI7C34.

LEI Issuing Authority. London Stock Exchange LEI Limited.

LEI Assigned, 21 February 2013.

LEI Status. ACTIVE.

LEI Last Updated, 16 December 2024.

UK Companies House. OE020656.

Registered Address. C/O The Treasury, PO Box 3724. Wellington 6140. New Zealand.

Source. SEC EDGAR sec.gov, openleis.com. GLEIF, UK Companies House. Treasury OIA OIA-20240751.

NEW ZEALAND POLICE

Company Number, 300001205.

NZBN; 9429041909966;

D-U-N-S Number, 590216123.

GST Number, 14-290-451.

Bank. Westpac, 03-0049-0000802-27.

Incorporated, 14 June 2017.

Registered Office, 180 Molesworth Street Wellington.

Source, OIA reference IR-01-24-5821, fyi.org.nz, 6 March 2024. Companienz.com sourced from New Zealand Companies Office.

Note. Refused to confirm or deny corporation status when asked directly by OIA. Stated reason, confirming or denying would be likely to prejudice the maintenance of the law.

No denial was made.

MINISTRY FOR PRIMARY INDUSTRIES

Company Number, 300001091.

NZBN; 9429000096157;

GST Number, 64-558-838.

Bank Account. Westpac NZ Government Branch Wellington. Account 03-0049-0001709-002.

Bank Ultimate Ownership. Westpac Banking Corporation. Sydney New South Wales Australia.

Crown Transactional Banking Contract. Westpac appointed exclusive Crown Transactional Banking provider September 2015.

Incorporated, 14 June 2017.

Registered Office. Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace Wellington.

Dun and Bradstreet Registration. Confirmed. Source, pub-

bc4337c37ace4322b17f10e487c841e0.r2.dev/evidence/mpi/MPI-Corp-001.jpg.

Source. Public records confirmed by Crown-Richard. CompaniesNZ.com sourced from New Zealand Companies Office. Westpac official website westpac.co.nz/institutional/relationship-management/government-banking.

MINISTRY OF JUSTICE

Company Number, 300001099.

Incorporated, 14 June 2017.

Registered Office. Justice Centre, 19 Aitken Street Wellington.

Function. Administers the New Zealand court system. Sets court fees. Manages court facilities.

Revenue. Generates revenue through court filing fees, hearing fees, and enforcement fees.

Source. Companienz.com sourced from New Zealand Companies Office. New Zealand Business Number Register. Senior Courts Act 2016. District Court Act 2016.

INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Company Number, 300000693.

Incorporated, 14 June 2017.

Function. Collects income tax. GST, and other Crown revenue from the living people.

Revenue. All collections flow to the Consolidated Fund under the Public Finance Act 1989.

Source. Companienz.com sourced from New Zealand Companies Office.

THE TREASURY

Company Number, 300002231.

Incorporated, 14 June 2017.

Function. Administers the Consolidated Fund. Services Crown debt obligations.

Administers bond issuance through the New Zealand Debt Management Office.
Source. Companienz.com sourced from New Zealand Companies Office.

RESERVE BANK OF NEW ZEALAND

Company Number, 300001626.
Incorporated, 14 June 2017.
Function. Issues currency. Regulates commercial banks. Sets monetary policy.
Source. Companienz.com sourced from New Zealand Companies Office.

DEPARTMENT OF THE PRIME MINISTER AND CABINET

Company Number, 300000327.
Incorporated, 14 June 2017.
Function. Supports the Prime Minister and Cabinet. Publishes official descriptions of the Crown including the admission that the Crown is a legal personification.
Source. Companienz.com sourced from New Zealand Companies Office.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS

Company Number, 300000326.
Incorporated, 14 June 2017.
Function. Administers the Births Deaths Marriages and Relationships Registration Act 2021. Creates and maintains the registration system through which legal fictions are created from birth.
Source. Companienz.com sourced from New Zealand Companies Office.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Company Number, 300000325.
Incorporated, 14 June 2017.
Function. Administers the prison system and community sentences.
Source. Companienz.com sourced from New Zealand Companies Office.

ELECTORAL COMMISSION

Company Number, 300000371.
Incorporated, 14 June 2017.
Function. Administers the electoral roll and elections.
Admissions. No consent for originating enrolments. Statutory compulsion sole basis.
No administrative removal mechanism. Data accessed from NZTA without knowledge.
No staff training on the distinction between the living man or woman and the legal person.
Source. Companienz.com sourced from New Zealand Companies Office. Electoral Commission OIA responses 2026/17, 2026/17A, 2026/23.

SERIOUS FRAUD OFFICE

Company Number, 300001738.

Incorporated, 14 June 2017.

Source. Companienz.com sourced from New Zealand Companies Office.

CROWN LAW OFFICE

Company Number, 300000307.

Incorporated, 14 June 2017.

Function. Provides legal advice to the Crown. Represents the Crown in significant litigation.

Source. Companienz.com sourced from New Zealand Companies Office.

GOVERNMENT COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY BUREAU

Company Number, 300000508.

Incorporated, 14 June 2017.

Function. Intelligence gathering and cybersecurity.

Source. Companienz.com sourced from New Zealand Companies Office.

MINISTRY OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Company Number, 300001101.

Incorporated, 14 June 2017.

Function. Administers welfare benefits and social services. Assigns MSD client numbers to the living people.

Source. Companienz.com sourced from New Zealand Companies Office.

NEW ZEALAND DEFENCE FORCE

Company Number, 300001198.

Incorporated, 14 June 2017.

Source. Companienz.com sourced from New Zealand Companies Office.

NOTE ON ALL 14 JUNE 2017 INCORPORATIONS

All entities listed above with an incorporation date of 14 June 2017 were incorporated on that single day as confirmed from the Companienz.com database sourced directly from the New Zealand Companies Office. No public announcement was made. No parliamentary debate was held. No public notice was given to the living people of New Zealand. The New Zealand Business Number Act 2016 created the framework. The mass incorporation of 14 June 2017 executed it.

APPENDIX THREE; KEY CONSTITUTIONAL INSTRUMENTS IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

He Whakaputanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tireni, 28 October 1835.
Reply of King William IV, 2 March 1836.
Letters Patent incorporating New Zealand into New South Wales, 15 June 1839.
Treaty of Waitangi, 6 February 1840.
New Zealand Constitution Act 1852. Westminster Parliament. Including Section 71 protection of Maori law and custom.
Native Lands Act 1862.
Native Lands Act 1865.
Tohunga Suppression Act 1907.
Tohunga Suppression Act Repeal Act 1962.
Social Security Act 1938.
Legislative Council Abolition Act 1950. Upper house abolished 1 January 1951.
Accident Compensation Act 1972.
Goods and Services Tax Act 1985.

Constitution Act 1986. Passed without referendum, without Treaty inclusion, and deliberately designed not to have the character of superior law. Confirmed from Department of Justice Report JL186/41, 14 July 1986.

State Owned Enterprises Act 1986.
Oranga Tamariki Act 1989.
Resource Management Act 1991.
Electoral Act 1993.
Local Government Act 2002.
Crown Entities Act 2004.
Corrections Act 2004.
Lawyers and Conveyancers Act 2006.
Income Tax Act 2007.
Immigration Act 2009.
Attorney General Act 2009.
Senior Courts Act 2016.
District Court Act 2016.
New Zealand Business Number Act 2016.
Social Security Act 2018.
Privacy Act 2020.
Reserve Bank of New Zealand Act 2021.
Births Deaths Marriages and Relationships Registration Act 2021.

APPENDIX FOUR; THE COMPANIENZ DISCREPANCY; DOCUMENTED

WHAT COMPANIENZ.COM STATES

Companienz.com states on its own landing page. Our data is sourced directly from the New Zealand Companies Office.

WHAT COMPANIENZ.COM RETURNS

Searches of Companienz.com return the following company numbers for government entities.

Ministry for Primary Industries. Company Number 300001091.

New Zealand Police. Company Number 300001205.

WHAT THE OFFICIAL REGISTER RETURNS

Direct searches of the official New Zealand Companies Register at companies.govt.nz do not return results for either entity.

THE DISCREPANCY

The data exists within the Companies Office system as evidenced by its appearance in a directory that states it sources directly from that system. It is not publicly searchable through the official channel. The living people who are subject to enforcement by these entities cannot access through the official register the commercial registration details of the entities enforcing against them.

THE OIA REQUEST

An OIA request to the Companies Office asking why this discrepancy exists has not received a substantive response. The discrepancy remains unexplained.

A further Official Information Act request has been filed with the Companies Office Registrar seeking the underlying registration data, record type, field label, creation date and legal basis for each number. The request seeks confirmation of whether each number represents a Companies Act incorporation, a state sector entity number, an NZBN related record or another administrative identifier. The response will be published as a supplementary exhibit to this report when received.

THE POLICE REFUSAL

When New Zealand Police were asked directly by OIA reference IR-01-24-5821 to confirm or deny whether they are a corporation they refused. The stated reason was that confirming or denying would be likely to prejudice the maintenance of the law. This is not a denial.

APPENDIX FIVE; THE PRIMARY SOURCE DOCUMENT

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE REPORT TO THE JUSTICE AND LAW REFORM COMMITTEE
CONSTITUTION BILL; 14 JULY 1986
REFERENCE JL186/41**

SIGNED BY THE SECRETARY FOR JUSTICE

DOCUMENT DETAILS

Title. Report to the Justice and Law Reform Committee on the Constitution Bill.

Author. Department of Justice. New Zealand.

Date, 14 July 1986.

Reference. JL186/41.

Signatory. Secretary for Justice.

Letterhead. Department of Justice. New Zealand.

Pages. Eleven pages.

SIGNIFICANCE

This is the primary source document confirming the deliberate construction of the constitutional framework documented in Chapter Six of this report. It is an official Crown document signed by the Crown's own Secretary for Justice. It confirms the following in the Crown's own words.

Confirmation One. The Treaty of Waitangi was deliberately excluded from the Constitution Bill. Direct quote from page two. Incorporating the Treaty of Waitangi or the bill of rights in this Bill would radically alter its nature.

Confirmation Two. Section 71 of the 1852 Act protecting Maori law and custom since 1852 was deliberately not re-enacted. Confirmed at pages ten and eleven.

Confirmation Three. The Constitution Bill was deliberately designed not to have the character of superior law. The Officials Committee stated at paragraph 6.6 page 57. Our order of reference relates to the bringing together and updating of constitutional provisions rather than the preparation of a constitution that would have the character of superior law. To propose entrenchment could well be seen as giving that character.

Confirmation Four. Parliament was confirmed to have full and unlimited power to make any law. Confirmed at page seven. No limits were proposed. None were included.

AVAILABILITY

This document is available from the New Zealand Parliamentary record. Reference JL186/41. It was obtained by Crown-Richard and forms part of the evidentiary foundation of this report.

This document is available for examination at livingsovereign.org. Evidence. Crown Sovereign in Right of New Zealand. It was obtained by Crown-Richard and forms part of the evidentiary foundation of this report.

APPENDIX SIX; THE ELECTORAL COMMISSION ADMISSIONS; DOCUMENTED

OIA RESPONSE 2026/17; 23 MARCH 2026

Confirmed. No consent exists for originating enrolments.

Confirmed. Statutory compulsion is the sole basis for enrolment.

Confirmed. An elector is defined as a person throughout the Electoral Act 1993.

OIA RESPONSE 2026/17A; 20 APRIL 2026

Confirmed. No consent mechanism exists or has ever existed.

Confirmed. Statutory compulsion remains the sole basis.

Confirmed. No administrative mechanism exists for removal from the electoral roll.

Confirmed. No remedial measures exist.

Confirmed. No compensation mechanism exists.

Confirmed. No staff training exists on the distinction between the living man or woman and the legal person.

Confirmed. A representative may have made the originating enrolment without the knowledge of the living man or woman.

THE NZTA DATA ACCESS

The Electoral Commission confirmed that enrolments have been made using data accessed from the NZTA driver licence database without the knowledge of the living man or woman. This is a breach of Information Privacy Principle Four of the Privacy Act 2020 which requires that personal information be collected directly from the individual concerned.

THE SIGNIFICANCE

These admissions are not allegations. They are confirmed from the Crown's own official responses. They establish the following.

The electoral roll is a list of legal fictions enrolled by compulsion without consent.

Enrolments have been made using data accessed without knowledge or authorisation.

No administrative exit exists for living men and women who do not consent.

The only remedy available is High Court judicial review.

A living man or woman must obtain the permission of a commercially administered court to assert their own living identity as separate from the enrolled fiction.

Source. Electoral Commission OIA responses 2026/17, 2026/17A, 2026/23. Privacy Act 2020 Information Privacy Principle Four. Electoral Act 1993 Section 82.

APPENDIX SEVEN; GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS

BAR

The physical barrier that historically divided the courtroom between the public area and the area where legal proceedings took place. Those admitted to practice law were admitted to pass the bar. In New Zealand the bar refers to the body of lawyers admitted to practice under the Lawyers and Conveyancers Act 2006. Every judge of every New Zealand court was first admitted to the bar. Every judge was a member of the New Zealand Law Society before appointment.

COMMON LAW

The body of law that developed through the decisions of courts over centuries based on the lived experience of communities of living men and women. Common law predates the Constitution Act 1986 by hundreds of years. It recognises the inherent rights of the living man and woman. It is not statute. It does not require parliamentary enactment. It exists independently of the management framework.

CROWN INC.

The entity operating as the Sovereign in Right of New Zealand. Commercially registered. A corporation. Not a living sovereign authority. Referenced throughout this report as CROWN INC. to reflect its true and documented nature.

ENTRENCHMENT

The constitutional mechanism by which certain provisions are protected from amendment by simple parliamentary majority. The Constitution Act 1986 was deliberately designed not to be entrenched as confirmed in the Department of Justice Report JL186/41 of 14 July 1986. Parliamentary sovereignty is therefore unlimited. Parliament can amend the Constitution Act itself by simple majority.

INDIVIDUAL means a natural person, other than a deceased natural person.

KAWANATANGA

A word coined for the Maori text of the Treaty of Waitangi. A transliteration of the English word governorship. It did not exist in the Maori language before the Treaty. The Rangatira who signed the Maori text ceded kawanatanga, governance, to the Crown. They did not cede sovereignty. The Waitangi Tribunal confirmed this in Wai 1040.

LEGAL FICTION

An entity that exists in law but not in nature. The Crown in Right of New Zealand is by its own admission a legal personification, a legal fiction. The legal person created through birth registration is a legal fiction. Legal fictions can hold rights and obligations in law. They are not living beings. They cannot suffer harm. They cannot hold inherent sovereign rights.

LEGAL PERSON

A construct of law that can hold rights and obligations. A legal person is distinct from the living man or woman. The State deals primarily with the legal person created

through birth registration, not with the living man or woman. The electoral roll, the IRD framework, the MSD framework, and the court system all operate primarily through the legal person.

LIVING MAN OR WOMAN

A living human being. A living man or woman exists in nature. They have inherent sovereign standing under natural law and Tikanga. Their inherent rights were not granted by parliament and cannot be removed by parliament. They are distinct from the legal person created in their name through birth registration.

NATURAL LAW

The law that governs the relationship between living beings and the world they inhabit. Natural law predates all statute. It recognises the inherent sovereign standing of every living man and woman. It cannot be repealed by parliament. It exists independently of the management framework.

Tikanga

The living customary law of the Tangata Whenua. Natural law expressed through the culture and memory of this land. It predates every introduced system and has never been extinguished.

NZBN

New Zealand Business Number. A globally unique commercial identifier assigned to entities participating in commercial activity in New Zealand under the New Zealand Business Number Act 2016. Government entities including law enforcement agencies hold NZBNs. The NZBN identifies an entity as a participant in the commercial framework.

SEC

United States Securities and Exchange Commission. The regulatory body for securities markets in the United States. The Crown in Right of New Zealand is registered with the SEC under CIK 0000216105, SIC Code 8888. Foreign Governments. It has filed financial statements with the SEC and previously registered bonds on the New York Stock Exchange. Current active listing London Stock Exchange under LEI 549300237GPHG2AI7C34.

SECTION 71

Section 71 of the New Zealand Constitution Act 1852. This provision protected Maori law and custom as a valid legal framework alongside English law. It provided that Maori laws were not to be invalid merely because of repugnancy to English laws. It stood for one hundred and thirty four years. It was deliberately not re-enacted in the Constitution Act 1986 on the recommendation of the Officials Committee supported by the Department of Justice. Its removal was documented in Department of Justice Report JL186/41 of 14 July 1986.

SOVEREIGN ACCOUNT

An account that holds assets in sovereign title, not as a liability of a commercial bank, backed by real assets, not subject to foreign ownership or control, not subject to commercial bank terms and conditions, transparent and accountable to the living people it serves. In September 2015 the New Zealand Government appointed Westpac Banking Corporation, a corporation 100 percent owned in Australia, as the exclusive provider of Crown Transactional Banking services to 35 or more core Crown agencies. New Zealand public funds held in Westpac accounts are held as a commercial liability of an Australian owned corporation accountable to Australian shareholders and Australian regulators, not in sovereign title accountable to the living people of New Zealand. This is a constitutional question that applies to the Crown itself, not only to individual ministries.

TINO RANGATIRATANGA

Full chieftainship. The tino rangatiratanga of the Rangatira over their lands, villages, and all their treasures was retained under Article Two of the Maori text of the Treaty of Waitangi. The Waitangi Tribunal confirmed in Wai 1040 that tino rangatiratanga was not extinguished by the Treaty.

END OF ALL APPENDICES