

(details) RE: Petition #21 of Ginsberg

From: **Joseph S. Haas** (josephshaas@hotmail.com)
Sent: Thu 3/22/12 9:01 AM
To: Paul Ingbretson (ingbretson_studio@yahoo.com)
Cc: marchon@gmail.com

Paul,

A copy of this is going to State Rep. George Lambert of Hillsborough District #27 for him to please pick up on his laptop later this morning AT the Committee Meeting starting at 10:00 a.m. in Room #____ to continue for Petition #1 plus for those of us who put in the pink cards to reply, of that I've replied already on Tuesday, but because so many of the committee members took off after that long-winded attorney in the Rochester case took 2.5 hours by diverting your attention away from THE hearing that counted for no minutes for THAT one, that you ought to adopt the policy of: (1) asking if there is anybody else who has not spoken and who would like to speak who has not yet presented a pink card to talk, to do so now and then: (2) anybody who has already spoken and would like to speak again so as to rebut what they have heard, etc.

In my case I've already spoken on this of just to get it on the record of the video tape, but because it was a summarized version limited to a 2-minute or less summary, between 4:00 and 4:30 p.m. for the many petitions and then the one half hour reply for the Rochester case to 5:00 p.m., and to explain this to you and others to try to simplify this, to please let me talk on this today.

Please look up the words to Article 74 of the N.H. Constitution: <http://www.nh.gov/constitution/judicial.html> of: "**[Art.] 74. [Judges to Give Opinions, When.]** Each branch of the legislature as well as the governor and council shall have authority to require the opinions of the justices of the supreme court upon important questions of law and upon solemn occasions.

June 2, 1784

Amended 1792 changing president to governor.

Amended 1958 substituting supreme court for superior court."

So in the Ginsberg case he presented #____ questions on page 3 of his 4-page appeal. Please answer this before we move onto the next step here, or you get this?

Of from a State Agency, or I guess what? Marital Master cases too that the Supremes can "decline" to take the case? Of that the operative word and not "denied", as they came to no conclusion on the merits of each question but that they REFUSED to take the case any further than from some entrance into a file folder to let it collect dust. Now Ginsberg has taken it to the Federal court, and hopefully to get some judicial opinion from there, but from what I've experienced they too never get down to brass tacks as they say, like for jury trials in 7th Amendment Common Law cases like the one by the Grafton County County Prosecutor against me for "Champerly" in the charge of Fall 1992 that was actually taken OFF the books in Spring 1992 by the Adkin case but nevertheless applied retrospectively BACK to me of this "common law" WAS a (paste tense) offense.

So for Ginsberg to take these #____ questions in his appeal to you all in this committee to put together in some package of Article 74 "important questions" to send to them of the N.H. Supreme Court for them to have to give their "opinion" on. Then when ANYbody runs into this and KNOWing that you have this power, to convince you that before you make your decision that you get their opinion first.

In the old days of back to the mid 1990s to almost year 2000 the Supremes could even "decline" to take a case from Superior court on appeal. That is what happened in my case, and ever since 1995 of my attempts at getting my Article 32 Petitions over to the appropriate committee by House Rule #4, my #____ questions have remained un-answered too. And so the reason for WHY my help in this Ginsberg case, because by helping him it can help me and #____ other victims who never got an Article 14 "complete" answer to their questions.

See you in an hour. Thanks, -- Joe



Date: Thu, 22 Mar 2012 04:32:06 -0700