

securitization fraud

The Illegal and Unlawful Securitization Fraud

By Anna Von Reitz

Information provided to H.E. Cardinal Mamberti and the Vatican Chancery Court regarding our Claim March 6 2005, January 19 2023 in seq:

One of the primary means used to derive Unjust Enrichment from all the foregoing described fraud schemes has been securitization.

The property assets seized upon via the False Registration processes were "securitized" and used as collateral backing debts run up by the same criminal Municipal Corporations operating out of the District of Columbia and their Territorial franchises operating as Territorial States of States and Territorial Counties, all of which were incorporated under the British Crown apparatus.

Illegally and unlawfully, the bodies of the living Americans were mischaracterized as "cargo" of the phony British Territorial U.S. Citizen "vessels" created for them without their knowledge or consent.

This results in enslavement and coerced obedience under force and color of law. It also results in fraud upon the courts.

It is patently and absolutely unlawful and illegal to securitize the flesh of a living man as an asset in trade or commerce (slavery) and it has also been unlawful and illegal to force his labor (peonage) since 1926; the brigands responsible for the current situation have hoped to avoid and evade these facts by mischaracterizing the victims as corporations, not living men --- while at the same time enforcing court judgements against these corporations as if they applied to the living men that these corporations have been named after.

The rationale appears to be that it is not illegal or unlawful to enslave a corporation--- for that matter, it isn't illegal or unlawful to murder, rob, rape, or otherwise despoil, defraud, or maim a corporation -- and so by labeling a corporation with a living man's name, the Perpetrators responsible for this scheme have contrived to excuse themselves and their courts by mischaracterizing the victims as corporations.

Part of their scheme has been to seize upon American homes and land and businesses, redefine these private property assets as corporation trust assets, and then foist off the debts that the Usurpers have accumulated as mortgages owed on the trust property.

Any would-be buyer has to pay off the mortgage owed on the trust property as a tenant, and once the mortgage is paid off, the victim can enter into a "future lease purchase agreement" --- and begin the whole process over again as a Lessor, instead of a Tenant, of the same trust property.

This avoids the fact that there is no valid "trust" established over American land holdings, only a "presumed" trust interest being asserted by the British Monarch based on the phony birth registration process and the assumption that all these purloined Americans are British Territorial U.S. Citizens and subjects of the King.

The "future lease purchase clause" admits that there is no sale of property involved in any mortgage transaction in this country. The bank is renting the property out to tenants who are obligated to pay the phony government's debt on the house asset which remains in their equally phony and unjustifiable "State Trust".

If after thirty years the victim, who is the only one to sign the mortgage, pays back all the money purportedly owed to himself (represented by the State Trust that the Perpetrators set up "for" us and manage "for" us) and pays off the mortgage owed by the Perpetrators and lodged against the assets of the State Trust, all he can get is a lease purchase agreement, because the State Trust doesn't actually own the property.

We repeat, there is no actual sale or transfer of property interest in any mortgage transaction in this country or in Britain or anywhere else we have examined. People are being led to believe that they are buying a home or a business or other asset, when in fact they are being bamboozled to pay off the debts owed by phony foreign property trusts and living as unsecured tenants in their own homes -- and at the end of the day, they are still only presumed to be leasing the trust property.

We wish for all these mortgage schemes to be overturned and for anyone who isn't knowingly, willingly, and factually a British Territorial U.S. Citizen, to be released from any mortgage agreements and for their property grants, patents, and surveys to be released to their direct and permanent ownership, together with any interest in any foreign "titles" attached to the property in question.

We wish for all the actual living property owners to be fully restored and for proper Bills of Sale to be issued to them, showing that their land is not subject to any royal trust or real estate title scheme, and not subject to any Municipal zoning scheme, either, and is in fact their land and part of their State of the Union.

We wish for these foreign State Trusts to be dissolved and the property assets released and returned to the care and keeping of the actual owners, without encumbrances or debts.

Put another way, all those future lease purchases need to be completed as Bills of Sale. All the mortgages that have been created based on False Presumptions of Municipal citizenship need to be

overturned and the present American owners held harmless.

The Securitization Fraud does not, however, end with securitization of a Promissory Note and the False Presumption that the victim owes a mortgage and the equally False Presumption that the credit extended by the bank is not owed back to the victim of this scam.

Another whole dimension of the securitization scheme involves bundling mortgages secured by promissory notes --- all obtained under conditions of deceit and non-disclosure --- and selling these bundled mortgages on to investors as separate "derivative" investments.

Please see the attached letter from an Australian Mortgage Servicing Company which discloses the fraud and admits how this information is deliberately hidden from the presumed-to-be tenants paying on mortgages and even from the bank personnel.

It is a horrific shame on the governments, Principals, politicians, military, corporate CEO's, and especially the banks, that this kind of crime has been allowed to run rampant for decades without being recognized, prosecuted, and stopped.

We are also presenting a synopsis of the First National Bank of Montgomery v Jerome Daly case, which provided a permanent decision owed to all Americans facing these fraudulent Legal Presumptions and practices and the resulting false claims in commerce being practiced against them by the Municipal Corporations housed in the District of Columbia and their commercial franchises:

RE: First National Bank of Montgomery vs. Jerome Daly

IN THE JUSTICE COURT

STATE OF MINNESOTA

COUNTY OF SCOTT

TOWNSHIP OF CREDIT RIVER

JUSTICE MARTIN V. MAHONEY

First National Bank of Montgomery,
Plaintiff

vs

Jerome Daly,
Defendant

JUDGMENT AND DECREE

The above entitled action came on before the Court and a Jury of 12 on December 7, 1968 at 10:00 am. Plaintiff appeared by its President Lawrence V. Morgan and was represented by its Counsel, R. Mellby. Defendant appeared on his own behalf.

A Jury of Talesmen were called, impaneled and sworn to try the issues in the Case. Lawrence V. Morgan was the only witness called for Plaintiff and Defendant testified as the only witness in his own behalf.

Plaintiff brought this as a Common Law action for the recovery of the possession of Lot 19 Fairview Beach, Scott County, Minn. Plaintiff claimed title to the Real Property in question by foreclosure of a Note and Mortgage Deed dated May 8, 1964 which Plaintiff claimed was in default at the time foreclosure proceedings were started.

Defendant appeared and answered that the Plaintiff created the money and credit upon its own books by bookkeeping entry as the consideration for the Note and Mortgage of May 8, 1964 and alleged failure of the consideration for the Mortgage Deed and alleged that the Sheriff's sale passed no title to plaintiff.

The issues tried to the Jury were whether there was a lawful consideration and whether Defendant had waived his rights to complain about the consideration having paid on the Note for almost 3 years.

Mr. Morgan admitted that all of the money or credit which was used as a consideration was created upon their books, that this was standard banking practice exercised by their bank in combination with the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, another private Bank, further that he knew of no United States Statute or Law that gave the Plaintiff the authority to do this. Plaintiff further claimed that Defendant by using the ledger book created credit and by paying on the Note and Mortgage waived any right to complain about the Consideration and that the Defendant was estopped from doing so.

At 12:15 on December 7, 1968 the Jury returned a unanimous verdict for the Defendant.

Now therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me pursuant to the Declaration of Independence, the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, the Constitution of United States and the Constitution and the laws of the State of Minnesota not inconsistent therewith ;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:

1. That the Plaintiff is not entitled to recover the possession of Lot 19, Fairview Beach, Scott County, Minnesota according to the Plat thereof on file in the Register of Deeds office.
2. That because of failure of a lawful consideration the Note and Mortgage dated May 8, 1964 are null and void.
3. That the Sheriff's sale of the above described premises held on June 26, 1967 is null and void, of no effect.
4. That the Plaintiff has no right title or interest in said premises or lien thereon as is above described.
5. That any provision in the Minnesota Constitution and any Minnesota Statute binding the jurisdiction of this Court is repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and to the Bill of

Rights of the Minnesota Constitution and is null and void and that this Court has jurisdiction to render complete Justice in this Cause.

The following memorandum and any supplementary memorandum made and filed by this Court in support of this Judgment is hereby made a part hereof by reference.

BY THE COURT

Dated December 9, 1968

Justice MARTIN V. MAHONEY
Credit River Township
Scott County, Minnesota
MEMORANDUM

The issues in this case were simple. There was no material dispute of the facts for the Jury to resolve.

Plaintiff admitted that it, in combination with the federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, which are for all practical purposes, because of their interlocking activity and practices, and both being Banking Institutions Incorporated under the Laws of the United States, are in the Law to be treated as one and the same Bank, did create the entire \$14,000.00 in money or credit upon its own books by bookkeeping entry. That this was the Consideration used to support the Note dated May 8, 1964 and the Mortgage of the same date. The money and credit first came into existence when they created it. Mr. Morgan admitted that no United States Law Statute existed which gave him the right to do this. A lawful consideration must exist and be tendered to support the Note. See *Ansheuser-Busch Brewing Company v. Emma Mason*, 44 Minn. 318, 46 N.W. 558. The Jury found that there was no consideration and I agree. Only God can create something of value out of nothing.

Even if Defendant could be charged with waiver or estoppel as a matter of Law this is no defense to the Plaintiff. The Law leaves wrongdoers where it finds them. See sections 50, 51 and 52 of Am Jur 2nd "Actions" on page 584 - "no action will lie to recover on a claim based upon, or in any manner depending upon, a fraudulent, illegal, or immoral transaction or contract to which Plaintiff was a party."

Plaintiff's act of creating credit is not authorized by the Constitution and Laws of the United States, is unconstitutional and void, and is not a lawful consideration in the eyes of the Law to support any thing or upon which any lawful right can be built.

Nothing in the Constitution of the United States limits the jurisdiction of this Court, which is one of original Jurisdiction with right of trial by Jury guaranteed. This is a Common Law action. Minnesota cannot limit or impair the power of this Court to render Complete Justice between the parties. Any provisions in the Constitution and laws of Minnesota which attempt to do so is repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and void. No question as to the Jurisdiction of this Court was raised by either party at the trial. Both parties were given complete liberty to submit any and all facts to the Jury, at least in so far as they saw fit.

No complaint was made by Plaintiff that Plaintiff did not receive a fair trial. From the admissions made by Mr. Morgan the path of duty was direct and clear for the Jury. Their Verdict could not

reasonably been otherwise. Justice was rendered completely and without denial, promptly and without delay, freely and without purchase, conformable to the laws in this Court of December 7, 1968.

BY THE COURT

December 9, 1968

Justice Martin V. Mahoney
Credit River Township
Scott County, Minnesota.

Note: It has never been doubted that a Note given on a Consideration which is prohibited by law is void. It has been determined, independent of Acts of Congress, that sailing under the license of an enemy is illegal. The emission of Bills of Credit upon the books of these private Corporations for the purpose of private gain is not warranted by the Constitution of the United States and is unlawful. See *Craig v. Mo.* 4 Peters Reports 912. This Court can tread only that path which is marked out by duty. M.V.M.

Jerome Daly had his own information to reveal about this case, which establishes that between his own revealed information and the fact that Justice Martin V. Mahoney was murdered 6 months after he entered the Credit River Decision on the books of the Court, why the case was never legally overturned, nor can it be.

As noted, Justice Mahoney was murdered, one of the many Americans murdered since the purported end of the Civil War, by commercial mercenary thugs employed to burn the actual Americans out of their homes, ambush them, steal their property, practice illegal confiscations using private courts and foreign laws to do it, and generally engage in all manner of lawless commercial racketeering, extortion, and confiscation under False Legal Presumptions and color of law.

This has taken place under a so-called "cloak of secrecy" yet many aspects of it have been known at least in part by people who were bought off, cowed down, or blackmailed.

What began in Britain under Queen Victoria, who acted under the influence of Soothsayers and "Spiritualists" who claimed to put her in touch with her dead husband, was spread to The United States, and from here throughout the world --- a cancerous growth of lies and criminality promoted by deluded people and minions of the Father of All Lies.

We wish for these crimes and their just remedies to be fully recognized and for the corporations and banks responsible to be liquidated, along with the purported public interest trusts and corporation trusts and all presumptions associated with these things, which have all been secretly misapplied to the General Public of this country and many others.

Issued by: Anna Maria Riezinger, Fiduciary
The United States of America

In care of: Box 520994
Big Lake, Alaska 99652

July 4th 2023

See this article and over 4200 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com

Revision #2

Created 9 January 2024 04:41:01 by Bryan

Updated 10 January 2024 22:40:48 by Bryan