



Via e-mail:  
[request-442166-  
c150b088@whatdotheyknow.com](mailto:request-442166-c150b088@whatdotheyknow.com)

21 November 2017

Our ref: FOI 2017-57

Dear Mr Smith,

### Freedom of Information Request

Thank you for your email on **31 October 2017**, in which you asked for the following information from the UK Supreme Court (UKSC):

*Please can you tell me whether the following is correct and applicable today:*

*March 17, 1649, the English Crown, including the Monarchy and the House of Lords, was legally and forever abolished and constitutionally prohibited in England through lawful Acts of Parliament. These laws declared it to be a treasonable act to re-establish monarchy in England, or proclaim anyone King or Queen.*

*1649, Charles Stuart, as the chief executive officer of England, was lawfully convicted of waging a treasonous war against his own people. Elizabeth Windsor, so-called Queen of England, has similarly been lawfully convicted of committing treason against her people and her coronation oath, and of personally participating in crimes against humanity. Accordingly, on February 25, 2013, Elizabeth Windsor was deposed from her office and ordered arrested by a lawful common law court of justice convened under the laws of England. ([www.itccs.org](http://www.itccs.org))*

Having assessed your questions, I have determined that they do not constitute a valid FOI request, and I am unable to deal with your enquiry under the terms of the Act.

I should explain that the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) can only be used to access recorded information held by a public body. Section 84 of the Act states that in order for a request for information to be handled as a Freedom of Information (FOI) request, it must be for recorded information. For example, a Freedom of Information request would be for a copy of a policy, rather than an explanation as to why we have that policy in place.

As part of our obligations under the FOIA, the UK Supreme Court has an independent review process. If you are dissatisfied with this response, you may write to request an internal review. The internal review will be carried out by someone who did not make the original decision, and they will re-assess how the Department handled the original request. If you wish to request an internal review, please write or send an email to the following address:

The Supreme Court Parliament Square London SW1P 3BD  
[enquiries@supremecourt.uk](mailto:enquiries@supremecourt.uk)  
[www.supremecourt.uk](http://www.supremecourt.uk)

William Arnold  
Director of Corporate Services  
UK Supreme Court  
Parliament Square  
London  
SW1P 3BD  
e-mail: [william.arnold@supremecourt.uk](mailto:william.arnold@supremecourt.uk)

If you remain dissatisfied after an internal review decision, you have the right to apply to the Information Commissioner's Office under Section 50 of the FOIA. You can contact the Information Commissioner's Office at the following address:

Information Commissioner's Office  
Wycliffe House  
Water Lane  
Wilmslow  
Cheshire  
SK9 5AF

Internet: [https://www.ico.gov.uk/Global/contact\\_us.aspx](https://www.ico.gov.uk/Global/contact_us.aspx)

I am sorry that I cannot be of further assistance on this occasion.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rebecca Lawson', written in a cursive style.

**Rebecca Lawson**  
Information Officer