

Ref: Norway v. Breivik

Case: 11-188627 MED-05

P O Box 5042  
George East, 6539  
Cell: (071) 170 1954

15 August 2012

Environmental Appeals Board<sup>1</sup>:  
Appeals of environmental information  
c / o Secretariat, Climate and Pollution  
PO Box 8100 Dep, 0032 OSLO,  
E-mail: [post@miljoklagenemnda.no](mailto:post@miljoklagenemnda.no)

#### Respondents:

Chairperson: Berit Reiss-Andersen  
Sec./Exec. Officer: Inger-Johanna Hammer  
Disciplinary Committee  
The Norwegian Bar Association  
Juristenes Hus  
Kristian Augusts gate 9, 0164 Oslo  
Tel: 22 03 50 50 | Fax: 22 11 53 25  
Email: Adv.For. Disciplinary Complaints  
([post@advokatforeningen.no](mailto:post@advokatforeningen.no)), IJ Hammer:  
([ijh@advokatforeningen.no](mailto:ijh@advokatforeningen.no))

Head: Judge Ernst Moe  
Disciplinary Board for Advocates  
Kristian Augustsgt. 9 0164 OSLO  
Tlf. 22 03 50 50 | Fax 22 11 53 25  
Disciplinary Committee: ([nemnden@jus.no](mailto:nemnden@jus.no))  
E-post: Judge Ernst Moe  
([ernst.moe@domstol.no](mailto:ernst.moe@domstol.no))

Environmental Appeals Board,

Request for Access to Environment Information in terms of S.28 (Freedom of Information Act) and S.10 (Environmental Law) RE: Norwegian Bar Association's Anti-Environmental Printed Complaints Policy

Disciplinary Complaints were filed against 170 Advocates in the Norway v. Breivik matter (4 with Disciplinary Board of Advocates ("Disciplinary Board"; 166 with Bar Association: Disciplinary Committee ("Disciplinary Committee"), by email. Complaints: CCBE Code of Ethics: Obstruction of Justice Participation in a StaliNorsk Political Psychiatry Show Trial, to (1) deny Defendant his Political Necessity Treason Trial; and (2) support Corruption of the Court to deny submittal to the Court of Controversial Evidence related to: [1] Media's Environment-Population-Terrorism Connection; [2] Norway's endorsement of Political Psychiatry & Psychiatric Fraud; [3] Masculine Insecurity Human Farming for Profit Kaffir Legal Matrix; [4] Norwegian Governments Endorsement for ANC's Terrorism & Breeding War; [5] Norwegian Commitment to Rainbow Race Multiculturalism is a Fraud.

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.miljoklagenemnda.no/>

Both the Disciplinary Board and Committee responded that according to their complaints policy; they refuse to accept complaints submitted by email; all complaints must be submitted in hardcopy (printed and sent by landmail).

[..] please be aware that all complaints must be submitted in writing and signed, and send us as two originals by ordinary mail. We would like to emphasize the importance of sending your complaints by ordinary mail due to the fact that the Disciplinary Board does not accept any complaints sent by e-mail.

All complaints must be submitted in writing and signed.

[. . ] 4. The documents submitted should always be sorted and copied in duplicate. Send your complaint as an original by regular post and a filled-out and signed form of consent

I subsequently filed a **Request for Access to Environment and Health Information in terms of S.28 (Freedom of Information Act) and S.10 (Environmental Law) RE: Complaints filed with Disciplinary Board against Attorneys for Victims Families in Norway v. Breivik matter.**

### **[3] The [Disciplinary Brd/Comm] Environmental Principles Decision-Making**

[1] Please provide [Disciplinary Brd/Comm] Complaints Environmental Principles decision-making justifications for demanding complainants waste paper, ink and non-renewable transporation resources by printing, signing and mailing complaints to the [Disciplinary Brd/Comm]; and refusing digitally signed complaints submitted by email, which are much more beneficial to the environment, and are exact environmentally digital copies of print versions?

[2] Please provide the [Disciplinary Brd/Comm] Complaints Environmental Principles decision-making justifications for printed complaints; when even third world goverments and [Disciplinary Brd/Comm] environmental policies allow courts and organisations to accept email complaints?

The [Disciplinary Brd/Comm's] responded by refusing to provide their environmental decision-making justifications:

“As previously mentioned, your potential complaints must be sent by ordinary mail due to the fact that the Disciplinary Board does not accept any complaints sent by e-mail.”

I again requested:

### **[3] The [Disciplinary Brd/Comm] Environmental Principles Decision-Making**

[1] Please provide [Disciplinary Brd/Comm] Complaints Environmental Principles decision-making justifications for demanding complainants waste paper, ink and non-renewable transporation resources by printing, signing and mailing complaints to the [Disciplinary Brd/Comm]; and refusing digitally signed complaints submitted by email, which are much more beneficial to the environment, and are exact environmentally digital copies of print versions?

[2] Please provide the [Disciplinary Brd/Comm] Complaints Environmental Principles decision-making justifications for printed complaints; when even third world goverments and [Disciplinary Brd/Comm] environmental policies allow courts and organisations to accept email complaints?

They responded:

As to your question on the "Complaints Environmental Principles", the Disciplinary Board does not have any such principles. We thus kindly ask you to follow the complaint procedure described to you in our previous e-mails. Your complaints will thus not be dealt with by the Disciplinary Board as long as they are sent by e-mail.

The Disciplinary Board will not answer further e-mails from you on this matter.

**Relief Requested:**

**An Order that the Disciplinary Board and Committee:**

1. Provide their Complaints Environmental Principles decision-making justifications for demanding complainants waste paper, ink and non-renewable transporation resources by printing, signing and mailing complaints to them; and refusing digitally signed complaints submitted by email, which are much more beneficial to the environment, and are exact environmentally digital copies of print versions?

Respectfully Submitted



Lara Johnstone  
**Habeus Mentem: Right 2 Legal Sanity**  
**Norway v. Breivik :: Uncensored**  
<http://norway-v-breivik.blogspot.com/>

Encl:

---

**From:** [Disiplinærnemnden for advokater \[mailto:nemnden@jus.no\]](mailto:nemnden@jus.no)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 19, 2012 10:26 AM  
**To:** Lara  
**Subject:** RE:

[Dear Ms Lara Johnstone,](#)

[The Disciplinary Board has received your complaints concerning numerous lawyers participating in the case against Anders Behring Breivik.](#)

[The Board's handling of complaints is regulated by chapter five of the Regulations for Advocates \(Regulations\) \(\*Advokatforskriften\*\). Complaints may in some cases be decided by the chair of the Board alone, cf. section 5-5 of the Regulations.](#)

[We would like to point out that anyone whose complaint is based on a \*legal interest\* is entitled to file a complaint. In practice this means that the attorney's client has a right to complain. Complaints regarding the other party's attorney may also be filed. It is thus primarily the parties involved in a case that can file a complaint against a lawyer, as the complainant must have a direct connection to the circumstances that the complaint is built on. If the complainant has no such legal interest, the complaint will be rejected. A complaint may also be rejected if it is obviously baseless.](#)

[Based on the information received in your complaints, it seems like these are not in compliance with the legal interest- requirement.](#)

[Should you nevertheless uphold your complaints, please be aware that all complaints must be submitted in writing and signed, and send us as two originals by ordinary mail. We would like to emphasize the importance of sending your complaints by ordinary mail due to the fact that the Disciplinary Board does not accept any complaints sent by e-mail.](#)

[All complaints must be submitted in writing and signed.](#)

- [1. Indicate the date you became aware of the matter\(s\) that is/are the subject of the complaint.](#)
- [2. Explain why you believe the attorney has violated the rules of proper conduct and/or why you believe the demanded fee is too high. Provide a brief presentation of the factual circumstances. It is very important, to the extent you can, that you provide dates for all events that are subject to your complaint.](#)
- [3. Enclose copies of letters and other documents that you believe are relevant to the complaint.](#)
- [4. \*\*The documents submitted should always be sorted and copied in duplicate.\*\* Send your complaint as an original by regular post and a filled-out and signed form of consent to:](#)

[Disiplinærnemnden](#)  
[Kristian Augustsgt. 9](#)  
[NO – 0164 Oslo](#)

[Label the envelope; "Disciplinary Complaint".](#)

[The Disciplinary Board and the Secretariat are subject to a duty of confidentiality.](#)

[Kind regards,](#)  
[The Disciplinary Board](#)

From: Lara Johnstone

Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2012 2:38 PM

To: 'Disiplinærnemnden for advokater'; 'Judge Ernst Moe'

Subject: Disciplinary Board Head: Judge Ernst Moe: Req for Env. & Health Info ITO S.28 and S.10

Head: Judge Ernst Moe

Sec: Beate Sundstrøm

Disciplinary Committee | Disiplinærnemnden

Kristian Augustsgt. 9 0164 OSLO

Tlf. 22 03 50 50 | Tlf: 22 03 51 08 | Fax 22 11 53 25

Dear Judge Moe,

Request for Access to Environment and Health Information in terms of S.28 (Freedom of Information Act) and S.10 (Environmental Law) RE: Complaints filed with Disciplinary Board against Attorneys for Victims Families in Norway v. Breivik matter: Violation of: 2.1 (Independence), 2.2 (Honesty), 2.4 (Multiculti Legal Respect) & 4,1 (Rule of Law Conduct) of CCBE Code of Ethics (Norwegian translation) : Obstruction of Justice Participation in a StaliNorsk Political Psychiatry Show Trial, to (1) deny Defendant his Political Necessity Treason Trial; and (2) support Corruption of the Court to deny submittal to the Court of Controversial Evidence related to: [1] Media's Environment-Population-Terrorism Connection; [2] Norway's endorsement of Political Psychiatry & Psychiatric Fraud; [3] Masculine Insecurity Human Farming for Profit Kaffir Legal Matrix; [4] Norwegian Governments Endorsement for ANC's Terrorism & Breeding War; [5] Norwegian Commitment to Rainbow Race Multiculturalism is a Fraud

Thank you for your email from the Disciplinary Board, dated Tue 6/19/2012 10:26 AM; in response to the 170 complaints I filed against Attorney's for Defendant (4) and Victims Families (166) in Norway v. Breivik matter. I am awaiting response from the Disciplinary Committee to inform me which Attorney's are not members of the Bar Association, whose complaints I am required to file with the Disciplinary Board. In the meantime, in response to the issues raised in your Tue 6/19/2012 10:26 AM email, I request the following information:

Request for Information:

[2] The Disciplinary Board's 'Legal Interest' Decision Making Justifications:

[A] Does the Disciplinary Board endorse the European Court of Human Rights (Lithgow & others v United Kingdom ) principle that every individual who files a legal application to a Norwegian Court has a right to a timeous and precise written response informing them whether their application has been accepted, or if denied, reasons for such denial, or to inform the individual of additional information required before the complaint can be accepted?

[B] If so, if or when any Judge refuses to provide any applicant in any court proceeding that any Norwegian Lawyer is a participant in, with such prompt written response, it is the duty of honourable and ethical Lawyers to uphold the respect for impartial court due process proceedings to object to, and expose such discriminatory corrupt practices being practiced by a Norwegian Magistrate or Judge?

[C] In consideration for [A] and [B], could the Disciplinary Board be detailed specific about how and why it alleges that my complaints do not meet the Disciplinary Boards 'legal interest requirement'?

[D] Is the Disciplinary Board's 'Legal Interest' Decision Making an Endorsement of Censoring Exposure of the Human-Farming-EcoSuicide-Kaffir-Legal-Matrix?: Whether the Disciplinary Board's decision-making to allege that my complaint did not meet the Disciplinary Board's 'legal interest requirement' had anything to do with silencing, suppressing or obstructing my legal applications to the court in this matter exposing the Human Farming Kaffir Legal Matrix: the Iron Mountain 'War is a Racket Military Industrial Complex's centralisation of power and tyranny , founded on Kaffir Law/Legislation which provides citizens with the Inalienable Eco-Suicide 'Right to Breed' and 'Right to Vote', but demands that Citizens need a Licence to Own a Gun, a Licence to Drive a Car, a Licence to Practice Law, a television licence, a credit licence, a licence to earn a living, a university exemption licence, a licence to fish, a licence to hunt, a liquor licence, a business licence, a marriage licence, a Marxist/Capitalist Traitor Hunting licence, etc, etc.

[D] Is the Disciplinary Board's 'Legal Interest' Decision Making an Endorsement of Censoring Exposure of Norway's endorsement of the Legal Establishment's use of 'Whores of the Court' Psychiatrists for the purposes of White Supremacy cultural supremacy and social control; ignoring the reality their 'Whores of the Court' Bullshit the public and the court with "psychobabble with scientific foundations equal to horoscope charts... the science behind it all is nonexistent"?

[3] The Disciplinary Board's Environmental Principles Decision-Making

[1] Please provide the Disciplinary Board's Complaints Environmental Principles decision-making justifications for demanding complainants waste paper, ink and non-renewable transportation resources by printing, signing and mailing complaints to the Disciplinary Board's; and refusing digitally signed complaints submitted by email, which are much more beneficial to the environment, and are exact environmentally digital copies of print versions?

[2] Please provide Disciplinary Board's Complaints Environmental Principles decision-making justifications for printed complaints; when even third world governments and Bar Associations environmental policies allow courts and organisations to accept email complaints?

[..]

Conclusion:

If an individual files a legal application to a Norwegian Court; does the Disciplinary Board's support the due process principles; that

1. such an individual has a right to a prompt and clear written response from the Court informing the applicant their legal application has been accepted or if not, whether further information is required or what is required from the individual for such legal application to be accepted;
2. When any legal applicant is denied such due process written response by the court; it is the honourable duty of all legal parties involved in the matter to uphold the respect for due process and the law, by demanding the Judge provide the applicant with a clear and written response to their application.

We live on a finite resource planet and not even Bar Associations have the right to believe that resources are infinite and to demand 'complaints' procedures that require complainants to waste scarce resources, when alternative procedures exist that are more environmentally resource friendly.

Please see PDF for full detailed request including footnotes.

Respectfully Submitted

Lara Johnstone  
Habeus Mentem: Right 2 Legal Sanity  
Norway v. Breivik :: Uncensored  
<http://norway-v-breivik.blogspot.com/>

---

From: Disiplinærnemnden for advokater  
Sent: Friday, June 22, 2012 2:49 PM  
To: 'Lara Johnstone'  
Subject: RE: Disciplinary Board Head: Judge Ernst Moe: Req for Env. & Health Info ITO S.28 and S.10

Lara Johnstone,

With reference to your e-mail of 20th of June, and your previous 170 complaints sent the Disciplinary Board last week.

A list of the Norwegian Bar Association's members is available at;<http://www.advokatforeningen.no/Sok/Sok-i-medlemslisten> .

Regarding your question concerning legal interest, we refer to the Regulations for Advocates (Advokatforskriften) § 5-3 and to our e-mail of June 19th where all the relevant information has been provided. If you have further questions regarding our complaint system, you can find more information at <http://www.advokatenhjelperdeg.no/artikler/complaint-against-an-attorney/> .

As previously mentioned, your potential complaints must be sent by ordinary mail due to the fact that the Disciplinary Board does not accept any complaints sent by e-mail.

Regards The Disciplinary Board

---

From: Lara Johnstone  
Sent: Friday, June 22, 2012 8:05 PM  
To: 'Disiplinærnemnden for advokater'; 'Judge Ernst Moe'  
Subject: RE: Disciplinary Board Head: Judge Ernst Moe: Req for Env. & Health Info ITO S.28 and S.10

Head: Judge Ernst Moe  
Sec: Beate Sundstrøm  
Disciplinary Committee | Disiplinærnemnden Kristian Augustsgt. 9 0164 OSLO Tlf. 22 03 50 50 |  
Tlf: 22 03 51 08 | Fax 22 11 53 25

Dear Judge Moe,

Thanks for your email sent Friday, June 22, 2012 2:49 PM.

As I wrote to the Disciplinary Committee: My apologies. Last time I contacted the Norwegian Bar Association, they kindly informed me whether the individual was a Bar Association member or not. I thought this was a service they provide; but clearly I am mistaken. I imagine the majority of complaints filed are member of the Bar Association; and the Disciplinary Committee and Disciplinary Board are simply stalling for time to obstruct the procedure of addressing my

complaints. Its very common masculine insecurity (reason and logic) legal behaviour when a lawyer does not want to address the facts in any individuals complaint. Nevertheless I shall do the search and confirm which are members of the Bar Association.

Re: Legal Interest & Disciplinary Boards Complaints Policy:

You have not answered my request for Access to Environment and Health Information in terms of S.28 (Freedom of Information Act) and S.10 (Environmental Law) in terms of the Bar Association's Legal Interest and Complaints policies:

I repeat:

Request for Information:

[2] The Disciplinary Board's 'Legal Interest' Decision Making Justifications:

[A] Does the Disciplinary Board endorse the European Court of Human Rights (Lithgow & others v United Kingdom) principle that every individual who files a legal application to a Norwegian Court has a right to a timeous and precise written response informing them whether their application has been accepted, or if denied, reasons for such denial, or to inform the individual of additional information required before the complaint can be accepted?

[B] If so, if or when any Judge refuses to provide any applicant in any court proceeding that any Norwegian Lawyer is a participant in, with such prompt written response, it is the duty of honourable and ethical Lawyers to uphold the respect for impartial court due process proceedings to object to, and expose such discriminatory corrupt practices being practiced by a Norwegian Magistrate or Judge?

[C] In consideration for [A] and [B], could the Disciplinary Board be detailed specific about how and why it alleges that my complaints do not meet the Disciplinary Boards 'legal interest requirement'?

[D] Is the Disciplinary Board's 'Legal Interest' Decision Making an Endorsement of Censoring Exposure of the Human-Farming-EcoSuicide-Kaffir-Legal-Matrix?: Whether the Disciplinary Board's decision-making to allege that my complaint did not meet the Disciplinary Board's 'legal interest requirement' had anything to do with silencing, suppressing or obstructing my legal applications to the court in this matter expoing the Human Farming Kaffir Legal Matrix: the Iron Mountain 'War is a Racket Military Industrial Complex's centralisation of power and tyranny , founded on Kaffir Law/Legislation which provides citizens with the Inalienable Eco-Suicide 'Right to Breed' and 'Right to Vote', but demands that Citizens need a Licence to Own a Gun, a Licence to Drive a Car, a Licence to Practice Law, a television licence, a credit licence, a licence to earn a living, a university exemption licence, a licence to fish, a licence to hunt, a liquor licence, a business licence, a marriage licence, a Marxist/Capitalist Traitor Hunting licence, etc, etc.

[D] Is the Disciplinary Board's 'Legal Interest' Decision Making an Endorsement of Censoring Exposure of Norway's endorsement of the Legal Establishment's use of 'Whores of the Court' Psychiatrists for the purposes of White Supremacy cultural supremacy and social control; ignoring the reality their 'Whores of the Court' Bullshit the public and the court with "psychobabble with scientific foundations equal to horoscope charts... the science behind it all is nonexistent"?

[3] The Disciplinary Board's Environmental Principles Decision-Making



[1] Please provide the Disciplinary Board's Complaints Environmental Principles decision-making justifications for demanding complainants waste paper, ink and non-renewable transportation resources by printing, signing and mailing complaints to the Disciplinary Board's; and refusing digitally signed complaints submitted by email, which are much more beneficial to the environment, and are exact environmentally digital copies of print versions?

[2] Please provide Disciplinary Board's Complaints Environmental Principles decision-making justifications for printed complaints; when even third world governments and Bar Associations environmental policies allow courts and organisations to accept email complaints?

[..]

Conclusion:

If an individual files a legal application to a Norwegian Court; does the Disciplinary Board's support the due process principles; that

1. Such an individual has a right to a prompt and clear written response from the Court informing the applicant their legal application has been accepted or if not, whether further information is required or what is required from the individual for such legal application to be accepted;
2. When any legal applicant is denied such due process written response by the court; it is the honourable duty of all legal parties involved in the matter to uphold the respect for due process and the law, by demanding the Judge provide the applicant with a clear and written response to their application.

We live on a finite resource planet and not even Bar Associations have the right to believe that resources are infinite and to demand 'complaints' procedures that require complainants to waste scarce resources, when alternative procedures exist that are more environmentally resource friendly.

Please see PDF sent to the Disciplinary Board by email on 20. juni 2012 14:38

Respectfully Submitted

Lara Johnstone  
Habeus Mentem: Right 2 Legal Sanity  
Norway v. Breivik :: Uncensored  
<http://norway-v-breivik.blogspot.com/>

---

From: Disiplinærnemnden for advokater  
Sent: Tuesday, July 10, 2012 12:38 PM  
To: 'Lara'  
Subject: RE: Disciplinary Board: Judge Moe: AG Ronning-Aaby | Arne Seland | Borghild Fjeld Gylvik | Ole Klanderud

Lara Johnstone,

Regarding your e-mail.

All relevant information regarding the requirement of legal interest in accordance with the Regulations for Advocates (Advokatforskriften) § 5-3 has been provided to you in our reply of June 22nd.


The Disciplinary Board's secretariat cannot answer your further questions in this regard. It is the Disciplinary Board that considers complaints against lawyers, and thus also considers whether the complainant has legal interest or not. Our information to you in this regard is based on the practice from the Disciplinary Board.

We would nevertheless like to point out that the Disciplinary Board is not a court; it is a board.

As to your question on the "Complaints Environmental Principles", the Disciplinary Board does not have any such principles. We thus kindly ask you to follow the complaint procedure described to you in our previous e-mails. Your complaints will thus not be dealt with by the Disciplinary Board as long as they are sent by e-mail.

The Disciplinary Board will not answer further e-mails from you on this matter.

Regards,  
The Disciplinary Board



**Norway v. Breivik**

**Case: 11-188627 MED-05**

*'Lawyers are either social engineers, or they are parasites. Social Engineer Lawyers aim to eliminate the difference between what the laws say and mean, and how they are applied; whereas legal parasites aim to entrench their parasitism from the difference between what the laws say and mean, and the application of such differences to their parasitic benefit.' - Prof. Charlie Houston, mentor of Justice Thurgood Marshall, *Simple Justice: History of Brown v. Board of Education*<sup>1</sup>*

P O Box 5042  
George East, 6539  
Cell: (071) 170 1954

Head: Judge Ernst Moe  
Sec: Beate Sundstrøm  
Disciplinary Committee | **Disiplinærnemnden**  
Kristian Augustsgt. 9 0164 OSLO  
Tlf. 22 03 50 50 | Tlf: 22 03 51 08 | Fax 22 11 53 25  
Disciplinary Committee: ([nemnden@jus.no](mailto:nemnden@jus.no))  
E-post: Judge Ernst Moe ([ernst.moe@domstol.no](mailto:ernst.moe@domstol.no))

Dear Judge Moe,

Request for Access to Environment and Health Information in terms of S.28 (Freedom of Information Act) and S.10 (Environmental Law) RE: Complaints filed with Disciplinary Board against Attorneys for Victims Families in Norway v. Breivik matter: Violation of: 2.1 (Independence), 2.2 (Honesty), 2.4 (Multiculti Legal Respect) & 4,1 (Rule of Law Conduct) of CCBE Code of Ethics (Norwegian translation)<sup>2</sup>: Obstruction of Justice Participation in a StaliNorsk Political Psychiatry Show Trial, to (1) deny Defendant his Political Necessity Treason Trial; and (2) support Corruption of the Court to deny submittal to the Court of Controversial Evidence related to: [1] Media's Environment-Population-Terrorism Connection; [2] Norway's endorsement of Political Psychiatry & Psychiatric Fraud; [3] Masculine Insecurity Human Farming for Profit Kaffir Legal Matrix; [4] Norwegian Governments Endorsement for ANC's Terrorism & Breeding War; [5] Norwegian Commitment to Rainbow Race Multiculturism is a Fraud

<sup>1</sup> *Simple Justice: The History of Brown v. Board of Education, the epochal Supreme Court decision that outlawed segregation, and of black America's century-long struggle for equality under law*, by Richard Kluger; Random House (1975) (pp126-129)

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.advokatforeningen.no/Etiske-regler/Internasjonale-regler/CCBEs-etiske-regler-norsk/>

Thank you for your email from the Disciplinary Board, dated Tue 6/19/2012 10:26 AM; in response to the 170 complaints I filed against Attorney's for Defendant (4) and Victims Families (166) in Norway v. Breivik matter. I am awaiting response from the Disciplinary Committee to inform me which Attorney's are not members of the Bar Association, whose complaints I am required to file with the Disciplinary Board. In the meantime, in response to the issues raised in your Tue 6/19/2012 10:26 AM email, I request the following information:

### **Request for Information:**

#### **[2] The Disciplinary Board's 'Legal Interest' Decision Making Justifications:**

[A] Does the Disciplinary Board endorse the European Court of Human Rights (*Lithgow & others v United Kingdom*<sup>3</sup>) principle that every individual who files a legal application to a Norwegian Court has a right to a timely and precise written response informing them whether their application has been accepted, or if denied, reasons for such denial, or to inform the individual of additional information required before the complaint can be accepted?

[B] If so, if or when any Judge refuses to provide any applicant in any court proceeding that any Norwegian Lawyer is a participant in, with such prompt written response, it is the duty of honourable and ethical Lawyers to uphold the respect for impartial court due process proceedings to object to, and expose such discriminatory corrupt practices being practiced by a Norwegian Magistrate or Judge?

[C] In consideration for [A] and [B], could the Disciplinary Board be detailed specific about how and why it alleges that my complaints do not meet the Disciplinary Boards 'legal interest requirement'?

[D] Is the Disciplinary Board's 'Legal Interest' Decision Making an Endorsement of Censoring Exposure of the Human-Farming-EcoSuicide-Kaffir-Legal-Matrix?: Whether the Disciplinary Board's decision-making to allege that my complaint did not meet the Disciplinary Board's 'legal interest requirement' had anything to do with silencing, suppressing or obstructing my legal applications to the court in this matter exposing the Human Farming<sup>4</sup> Kaffir<sup>5</sup> Legal Matrix: the Iron Mountain<sup>6</sup> 'War is a Racket<sup>7</sup> Military Industrial Complex's centralisation of power and tyranny<sup>8</sup>, founded on Kaffir Law/Legislation which provides citizens with the Inalienable Eco-Suicide 'Right to Breed' and 'Right to Vote', but demands that Citizens need a Licence to Own a Gun, a Licence to Drive a Car, a Licence to Practice Law, a television licence, a credit licence, a licence to earn a living, a

---

<sup>3</sup> *Lithgow & others v. United Kingdom* (1986) \* EHR 329 § 110 <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/publisher,ECHR,,GBR,3ae6b7230,0.html>

<sup>4</sup> Human Farming: Story of Your Enslavement: <http://youtu.be/gHAnrXCvavc>

<sup>5</sup> Radical Honoursty Definitions of Kaffir are not Racial, but Behavioural: For Example:

\* 'Kaffir Behaviour': Cultural Beliefs and Procreation Behaviour Definition: Individuals who either independently or as a result of their cultural value systems, are incapable of, or unwilling to, practice sexual restraint and procreation responsibility; who consequently breed cockroach-prolifically without personal financial or psychological responsibility to, or emotional concern for, their offspring; and/or who abuse women and children as sexual or economic slaves procreated for such purpose; and/or whose cultural ideal of manhood endorses non-consensual sex (rape) as their sexual slavery entitlement, etc.

\* 'Kaffir Etymology': Original Etymological Definition for 'Kaffir': The word kāfir is the active participle of the Semitic root K-F-R "to cover". As a pre-Islamic term it described farmers burying seeds in the ground, covering them with soil while planting; as they till the earth and "cover up" the seeds; which is why earth tillers are referred to as "Kuffar." Thus, the word kāfir implies the meaning "a person who hides or covers"; To conceal, deny, hide or cover the truth.

<sup>6</sup> Report from Iron Mountain: On the Possibility and Desirability of Peace [http://www.teachpeace.com/Report\\_from\\_Iron\\_Mountain.pdf](http://www.teachpeace.com/Report_from_Iron_Mountain.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> War is a Racket, by USMC General Smedley Bulter <http://warisaracket.org/dedication.html>

<sup>8</sup> "In order to achieve this goal [of world domination], we must introduce [the right to vote] universal suffrage beforehand, without distinctions of class and wealth. Then the masses of people will decide everything; and since it [universal suffrage] is controlled by us we will achieve through it the absolute majority, which we could never achieve if only the educated and possessing classes had the vote." -- Protocols of the Elders of Zion, 10th Sitting, Wallstein Pub. House, ISBN 3-89244-191-x, p. 60

university exemption licence, a licence to fish, a licence to hunt, a liquor licence, a business licence, a marriage licence, a Marxist/Capitalist Traitor Hunting licence, etc, etc.

[D] Is the Disciplinary Board's 'Legal Interest' Decision Making an Endorsement of Censoring Exposure of Norway's endorsement of the Legal Establishment's use of 'Whores of the Court' Psychiatrists for the purposes of White Supremacy cultural supremacy and social control; ignoring the reality their 'Whores of the Court' Bullshit the public and the court with "psychobabble with scientific foundations equal to horoscope charts... the science behind it all is nonexistent"?

### [3] The Disciplinary Board's Environmental Principles Decision-Making

[1] Please provide the Disciplinary Board's Complaints Environmental Principles decision-making justifications for demanding complainants waste paper, ink and non-renewable transportation resources by printing, signing and mailing complaints to the Disciplinary Board's; and refusing digitally signed complaints submitted by email, which are much more beneficial to the environment, and are exact environmentally digital copies of print versions?

[2] Please provide Disciplinary Board's Complaints Environmental Principles decision-making justifications for printed complaints; when even third world governments and Bar Associations environmental policies allow courts and organisations to accept email complaints?

### **ECHR: Rule of law requires adequately Precise and Accessible Legislation:**

In *Lithgow & others v United Kingdom*<sup>9</sup>, the European Court of Human Rights held that the rule of law requires provisions of legislation to be adequately accessible and sufficiently precise to enable people to regulate their affairs in accord with the law:

"As regards the phrase "subject to the conditions provided for by law", it requires in the first place the existence of and compliance with adequately accessible and sufficiently precise domestic legal provisions (see, amongst other authorities, the alone judgment of 2 August 1984, Series A no. 82, pp. 31-33, paras. 66-68)."

### **Act on the Right of Access to Documents in Public Administration (the Act).**

§ 28 Disclosure requirement<sup>10</sup>: Access can be demanded in writing or orally. Access to information must relate to a specific cause or a reasonable extent, matters of a particular species. This does not apply when it is demanded access to a journal or similar registry.

### **Environmental Public<sup>11</sup>**

When products and activities that may affect the environment and health, we have the right to more information than usual, both from private and public. Check how you can go to the manufacturer, importer, dealer, municipal or a private company to get the information you are looking for.

### **LOV 2003-05-09 nr 31: Act concerning the right to env. Info. and public participation in decision-making processes relating to the environment (environmental law).<sup>12</sup>**

<sup>9</sup> *Lithgow & others v. United Kingdom* (1986) \* EHRR 329 § 110 <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/publisher,ECHR,,GBR,3ae6b7230,0.html>

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.lovdato.no/all/hl-20060519-016.html#28>

<sup>11</sup> [http://ezcust0003.web1.dedicated99.no.webdeal.no/offentlighet\\_user/Miljoeoffentlighet](http://ezcust0003.web1.dedicated99.no.webdeal.no/offentlighet_user/Miljoeoffentlighet)

§ 10 The right to environmental information held by a public body<sup>13</sup>

(1) Everyone has the right to obtain environmental information from a public body, so far as information is provided to the competent body or body of knowledge covered by the obligation under §§ 8 or 9, and it is not exempt from the information right under this Act.

(2) Environmental information is the competent authority when the information: a) is in the public authority itself, or b) held by a natural or legal person on behalf of the public authority.

(3) A request for environmental information may be rejected if it is too generally formulated or does not provide sufficient basis to identify the claim. Before a claim is rejected, the applicant shall be given reasonable assistance to formulate the request in such a way that it can be treated.

(4) If the requirements for access aimed at the wrong agency, it shall as soon as possible to forward the claim to the right authority or guidance as to which public bodies are believed to have information.

**Conclusion:**

If an individual files a legal application to a Norwegian Court; does the Disciplinary Board's support the due process principles; that

1. such an individual has a right to a prompt and clear written response from the Court informing the applicant their legal application has been accepted or if not, whether further information is required or what is required from the individual for such legal application to be accepted;
2. When any legal applicant is denied such due process written response by the court; it is the honourable duty of all legal parties involved in the matter to uphold the respect for due process and the law, by demanding the Judge provide the applicant with a clear and written response to their application.

We live on a finite resource planet and not even Bar Associations have the right to believe that resources are infinite and to demand 'complaints' procedures that require complainants to waste scarce resources, when alternative procedures exist that are more environmentally resource friendly.

Respectfully Submitted



Lara Johnstone  
**Habeus Mentem: Right 2 Legal Sanity**  
**Norway v. Breivik :: Uncensored**  
<http://norway-v-breivik.blogspot.com/>

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.lovdata.no/all/hl-20030509-031.html#10>

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.lovdata.no/all/hl-20030509-031.html#10>

---

**From:** Disiplinærnemnden for advokater [mailto:nemnden@jus.no]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 19, 2012 10:26 AM  
**To:** Lara  
**Subject:** RE:

Dear Ms Lara Johnstone,

The Disciplinary Board has received your complaints concerning numerous lawyers participating in the case against Anders Behring Breivik.

The Board's handling of complaints is regulated by chapter five of the Regulations for Advocates (Regulations) (*Advokatforskriften*). Complaints may in some cases be decided by the chair of the Board alone, cf. section 5-5 of the Regulations.

We would like to point out that anyone whose complaint is based on a *legal interest* is entitled to file a complaint. In practice this means that the attorney's client has a right to complain. Complaints regarding the other party's attorney may also be filed. It is thus primarily the parties involved in a case that can file a complaint against a lawyer, as the complainant must have a direct connection to the circumstances that the complaint is built on. If the complainant has no such legal interest, the complaint will be rejected. A complaint may also be rejected if it is obviously baseless.

Based on the information received in your complaints, it seems like these are not in compliance with the legal interest- requirement.

Should you nevertheless uphold your complaints, please be aware that all complaints must be submitted in writing and signed, and send us as two originals by ordinary mail. We would like to emphasize the importance of sending your complaints by ordinary mail due to the fact that the Disciplinary Board does not accept any complaints sent by e-mail.

All complaints must be submitted in writing and signed.

1. Indicate the date you became aware of the matter(s) that is/are the subject of the complaint.
2. Explain why you believe the attorney has violated the rules of proper conduct and/or why you believe the demanded fee is too high. Provide a brief presentation of the factual circumstances. It is very important, to the extent you can, that you provide dates for all events that are subject to your complaint.
3. Enclose copies of letters and other documents that you believe are relevant to the complaint.
4. **The documents submitted should always be sorted and copied in duplicate.** Send your complaint as an original by regular post and a filled-out and signed form of consent to:

Disiplinærnemnden  
Kristian Augustsgt. 9  
NO – 0164 Oslo

Label the envelope; "Disciplinary Complaint".

The Disciplinary Board and the Secretariat are subject to a duty of confidentiality.

Kind regards,  
The Disciplinary Board