How to Make Money and Not Follow the Law

By J.McGuire

Do anything you want and when sued, hire an attorney, file a Motion for Summary Judgment in a court where the judge will not follow the law. That's how the banks do it!

The Summary Judgment should only be granted when there are no material issues in **dispute**. **Your Honor, Your Honor, got your ears on,** the homeowners has **disputed** the debt. One needs not to look to Black's Law to understand the meaning of dispute. **Dispute** is defined as; "to question the truth, validity"[1].

Not only is the homeowner disputing the debt, they are disputing the banks right to foreclose. **Two disputes.** The debt is the note; the right to foreclose is the security instrument.

The New York Times published an article on August 12, 2010 titled: "Wall Street Slides Further on More Signs of Slowdown".[2]

Bloomberg also published an article on August 12, 2001 titled: "Fed Decision Will Eventually Buoy Risk, Pimco's Crescenzi Says".[3]

Let us look at a 2006 article written by Laurence J. Kotlikoff, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis *Review*, July/August 2006, *88*(4), pp. 235-49, **"Is the United States Bankrupt?"**[4]

Kotlikoff wrote, *"Does the United States fit this bill? No one knows for sure, but there are strong reasons to believe the United States may be going broke". Appears, the St. Louis Fed Bank identified years ago who was in part responsible for today's financial fiasco, "How are the Bush administration and Congress planning to deal with the fiscal gap? The answer, apparently, is to make it worse by expanding discretionary spending while taking no direct steps to raise receipts." , "This administration's concern with long-term fiscal policy is typified by the way it treated the Treasury's original fiscal gap study. The study was completed in the late fall of 2002 and was slated to appear in the president's 2003 budget to be released in early February 2003. But when Secretary O'Neill was ignominiously fired on December 6, 2002, the study was immediately censored."*

Democrat or Republican's fault, sorry folks, want go there.

One has to wonder why the author has jumped from one topic to another. The original topic was that of granting a "Motion of Summary Judgment" when there is an issue of dispute.

The banks do it to create and air of confusion and to divert ones attention from understanding the true facts. The law has been broken, the bell has been rung. The banks cannot stand before a court of equity and tell the truth and then expect to win. So counsel for the banks lie, deceive and provide as much deception it takes to win.

[1] http://www.thefreedictionary.com/dispute
[2] http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/13/business/13markets.html?hp
[3] http://noir.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=20601087&sid=aqFmR9GkDD5w&pos=7
[4] http://research.stlouisfed.org/publications/review/06/07/Kotlikoff.pdf

Why do the banks go to such extreme measures? They want to keep the money they stole. They need to make sure their fraud remains hidden. They need the world to believe they are the victim.

Here is the "whoop ass", the judges believe that homeowners are deadbeats and the homeowner would be getting a free house. What the judges can't see or don't want to see is the banks have committed crimes. The court is not giving away a free house; the homeowners are requesting the courts to stop a foreclosure that is not legal. The security instrument is a nullity. The banks claim to title to the house is within this nullified security instrument. If a correct party can produce the note and a continuous perfected lien then they may foreclose upon a default. As in almost all cases involving MERS the security instrument has been rendered a nullity, however; by operation of law if the holder in due course of the note comes forward they at most could file suit for a monetary judgment.

What would be an interesting research topic; after the judges leave the bench, how many end up doing legal work for the banks.

Mainstream media consistently in their reporting publish statements made by optimistic analysts and economists in an effort to minimize the severity of the financial crisis to protect their financial interest or reputation.

Pessimistic analysts and economists that predict the worse is yet to come are made out to be "nuts".

Albert Edwards, an investment strategist in London for the French bank Société Générale, forecasts a ***"bloody, deep recession"***[5], this author agrees.

[5] http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/10/business/global/10gloom.html?_r=1&hpw