

**United States District Court  
District of Minnesota**

Christopher Roller

(Plaintiff)

vs.

Bosley

(Defendant)

Civil Action No. 07-1296 (JRT/FLN)  
Memo in Support of Motion for Partial  
Summary Judgment

Memo in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment

ARGUMENTS

There is an undisputed allegation that Bosley attempted to kill Chris Roller 2 Oct 2006, resulting in a side-effect of the Amish school shooting. This allegation is made fact via the "fess-up" phenomenon (truth serum) which prevents people from lying to me with a false statement. It is possible that Bosley did not conspire the hit, and it was other demons in Chicago in route to my train, and that it was a mere coincidence I got my hair transplants that day while in Chicago. I'm trying to flush out (guess) who did the hit. Bosley just needs to deny it, and I rescind the motion.

Understand, I'm accusing a member of Bosley of trying to kill me. Make a statement denying it and I go away. Please make a direct statement, "Bosley did [did not] try to kill Chris Roller 2 Oct 2006".

Don't want to hear this is not proof. The truth is the proof. I realize the defense finds this truth stuff unusual, but here's how it works. I make accusations, and you

need to deny it, otherwise the accusation is true. If I accuse you of trying to kill me, then simply state it didn't happen. If you don't, then it's because you can't lie, and thus you did it. If I say I have an infringeable patent and I'm wrong, then deny it. This is what you did. Good job. See, you can do it! If I say you were in a car wreck with me and I'm mistaken, then tell me. This is how an investigation works. If a police officer asks if you committed a crime, you simply deny it if you didn't do it because it's comfortable and it's the truth under oath. Of course, if you did do it, you might not admit it because it's uncomfortable, and you're incapable of lying under oath, thus tongue-tied. I'm conducting an investigation in a similar fashion. You see, I need discovery to get to the truth. The defense runs away trying to say I don't have any proof. It's the chicken and egg concept. I need discovery to have a claim so I can get discovery. So, what I did was to create opening discovery by making accusations. I still have yet to have any acknowledgement of those claims of murder conspiracy against Chris Roller. I assume this is a provable (fact) methodology, but I wanted to further my method of discovery. You see, I'm making the motion for partial summary judgment to help provide evidence of the hit. What I expected in the reply is "Bosley did not try to kill you, Chris. Thus you have no claim." which would put my mind at ease. Instead I got an ignoring of the hit. You see, it's an interrogation method without the torture. Nobody is going to make a statement in a reply, "Yes a member of the Bosley tried to kill you, Chris Roller". What the defense does is avoid the question if the truth is uncomfortable (can't lie), and sidetrack it with something else, like ignoring the hit allegation completely. When I make an accusation, I expect something in direct response to it. Like when I said, "I'm suing for patent infringement", defense spoke right up and said "Chris, you're not ripe with no issued patent and thus nothing to infringe, and thus no claim."

Defense defended that claim, but didn't acknowledge my hit claims. That's because the defense is trying to avoid the uncomfortable truth, that Chris Roller has been conspired against.

Normally, a dispute for summary judgment would argue a different viewpoint. For example, I claim "I stopped at an intersection prior to the crash", and the defense comes back and says, "no you ran the stop sign and crashed". If I say, "Bosley tripped me.", I expect a statement of counter, "Bosley did not trip you Chris. You're mistaken". That's all I'm asking, to acknowledge the accusation with a true statement, not side-step it. With nothing said to deny the accusation, it means it's an undisputed claim for relief.

So please make a statement, "Bosley did [did not] try to kill Chris Roller". This is truth under oath time. Tell me that Bosley didn't do it, and it's the truth and I go away. Otherwise, it happened, and I have an undisputed claim to avoid dismissal and grant partial summary judgment.

This "fess-up" phenomenon (truth serum) has been proven by a number of cases now, including this one. Further proof of the phenomenon is the fact that no one under oath can make the statement "[Name] does not have godly powers". Try it! I do suspect everyone can fly outside of Chris Roller's reality bubble, or walk on water. Try this one, "[Name] cannot walk on water." We got ourselves a weird world if no one can make that statement.

Here's the problem with all the hit attempts and poisoning attempts. Take a sample of a hundred people, and ask them if hit attempts and poisonings would be good for a holy godly entity.  $\geq 90$  of the 100 are going to say, "Oh crap, those

poisonings and hits can't be good! Chris Roller is going to hell in a hand-basket. Chris Roller is probably going to turn tables on us at the 11th hour and initiate a hell-ish world-wide magic whoop-ass on the planet." So see, this is the major detriment to the crimes committed against Chris Roller. Perhaps the poisonings are a mental/spirit cancer for Chris Roller. Perhaps there's a breaking point, a point of no return for Chris Roller's good-ness. Maybe the effects won't be apparent for years. There is also emotional/mental distress related to the hits - I'm nuts now because of the hits/poison.

I charge \$trillion/hit. That's cheap when you consider my worth in about 20 years will be infinity, and my projected loss/death/value of Chris Roller would be infinity. I could charge \$infinity, but I'm only charging \$trillion.

This partial summary judgment is a civil tort for criminal wrong - for assault (U.S.C 18 § 111), fraud, projected wrongful death, attempted murder (U.S.C 18 § 1113), conspiracy to commit murder (U.S.C 18 § 1117), and emotional/mental distress (I'm nuts now because of the hit/poison). Statute of limitations is 6 years from the date of discovery of the fraud/crime per MN § 541.05.

In the reply to this motion, all I need to see is

"Bosley did not try to kill Chris Roller on 2 Oct 2006."

and I will rescind this motion. Otherwise, the hit occurred, and the fact remains undisputed, and this is the evidence needed for partial summary judgment in the amount of \$trillion.

CONCLUSION

For reasons stated above, Chris Roller is asking for partial summary judgment in the amount of \$1,000,000,000,000 (\$trillion).

Date: \_\_3 July 2007\_\_

\_\_s/\_Christopher A. Roller\_\_  
Christopher Roller (pro se)  
13150 Harriet Ave. S #273  
Burnsville , MN 55337  
952.239.6410