UPDATED	**LAW OFFICES OF LALIT K JAIN ESQ** **Practice of Law in NY State, US Tax and District Courts,** **US Supreme Court, and *all* Courts in India.**	**Fon: 718-255-6576** **Cell: 718-316-5921** **Fax: 347-637-5498**

Scripted by **L**alit **K J**ain **Esq** ("***LKJESQ***"), ***this pragmatic*** **M**emorandum **o**f **L**aw ("***LKJMOL***") ***does not create*** attorney-client relationships, guarantees, and/or duties in any jurisdiction when used in and attached to legal briefs ***revealing scapegoatings, scammings and other Injustices***.

It's a just reminder. ***All courts*** that applied inapplicable laws to fictions as facts like marital presumptions and committed or perpetuated scapegoatings (blaming others for wrongdoings they did not commit) and other ***Injustices*** as ***unlawful unpragmatic*** **j**uri**sp**rudence ("***JIP***") "***have to***" ***promptly reverse and correct all errors***, ***administer*** equal Justice under the basic law and ***apply*** applicable laws to facts as truths like DNA-matches as ***lawful pragmatic*** **t**ruth**isp**rudence ("***TIP***").[1]

Order compensatory and punitive reliefs against those benefiting from their own wrongdoings.[2]

Remember that zeal above candor by lawyers,[3] fraud on the courts,[4] lack of jurisdiction and/or authority, ***dehumanizing women and babies*** and resulting **d**ecisions, **o**rders and/or **j**udgments ("***DOJs***") are ***void*** and dangerous nullities.[5] ***SCOTUS*** Rule 10 review is discretionary.[6]

Learn **a**nd **l**ive **i**n **t**ruth **k**nowing **J**ustice **a**lways **i**nsures **n**ature.

Lalit K Jain Esq

---

[1] ***People v Onuorah Docket No***. **2012QN040877 (NYC Crim. Ct., Queens Cnty., Oct 31, 2013) (Zoll, J.)** Tr. 20:25-21:2 **(**"THE COURT: …I do find the Defendant guilty … and I am prepared to impose a sentence, unless you want to be heard.") Tr. 21:3 ("MR. JAIN: Yes, Your Honor ….**")**; Tr. 22:10-11 ("Parties step up real quick."); ("Whereupon a bench discussion was held."); Tr. 22:12-22 ("THE COURT: After re-examining the statute more closely … as I reread it many, many more times, my initial reading of it was incorrect …."); Tr. 23:2-6 ("…I have to change my verdict to not guilty…. Case dismissed."); Tr. 23:7 ("COURT OFFICER: You're free to go."). Certified transcript with clarifying notes by Lalit K Jain Esq on page 1, not part thereof, ***is attached***; see also www.TruthIsPrudence.Com.

[2] "We are facing a principle more nearly ultimate than either waiver or estoppel, one with roots in the yet larger principle that no one shall be permitted to found any claim upon his own inequity or take advantage of his own wrong (***Riggs*** v ***Palmer***, **[1889]** 115 NY 506)."
Imperator Realty Co. ***v Tull***, ***1920***, ***Cardozo J***., ***Ct App***., 228 NY 447, 457.

[3] **ABA** ***Model Rules of Professional Conduct: Preamble & Scope***, A Lawyer's Responsibilities…[8] **(**"...when an opposing party is well represented, a lawyer can **[*but does not have to*]** be a ***zealous*** advocate on behalf of a client and at the same time assume that justice is being done."). See NY Rule of Professional Conduct, 22 NYCRR 1200.0, Rule 3.3. "[W]hile an attorney should represent his client with singular loyalty, ***that loyalty obviously*** does not demand that he act dishonestly or fraudulently; on the contrary his loyalty to the court, as an officer thereof, ***demands integrity and honest dealing with the court***. And when he departs from that standard in the conduct of a case he perpetrates fraud upon a court... (ci[ting] cases)," ***Demjanjuk*** **v** ***Petrovsky***, 1993, 6th Cir., 10 F3d 338, 352. (emphasis added).

[4] **"**…In the case of ***Michoud v Girod***, **[*1846*]** 4 How 503, lately decided in this Court, transactions were investigated after a lapse of more than twenty years; but the facts proving the fraud were all on the record, and were not disputed. The false accounts made out against the estate of the deceased by the executors were on file, and their inequity was apparent on their face…."
Hammond v Hopkins, **1892**, ***CJ Fuller***, 143 US 224, 251-252.

[5] "…where a court **[*with AJI*]** has jurisdiction, it has a right to decide every question which occurs in the cause…But if it act without authority, its … **[*DOJs*]** … are regarded as ***nullities***. They are not voidable but simply void…and all persons…executing such judgments or sentences are considered in law as trespassers **[**in law ("***Outlaws***" and "***Scofflaws***") ***violating equal Justice under law***]." (emphasis added).
Elliott v Lessee of Piersol, 1828, 26 US (1 Pet.) 328, 340.

[6] "…Review on a writ of certiorari is not a matter of right, but of judicial discretion. … A petition for **[*it*]** …is rarely granted when the asserted error consists of erroneous factual findings or the misapplication of a properly stated rule of law." The **S**upreme **C**ourt **o**f **t**he **U**nited **S**tates ("***SCOTUS***") **Rule 10.**