

**United States District Court
District of Minnesota**

Christopher Roller
(Plaintiff)

vs.

Central Intelligence Agency
(Defendant)

Civil Action No. 07-1298 JNE/JJG

Reply to Oppose Dismiss and for
Partial Summary Judgment

Reply to Oppose Dismiss and for Partial Summary Judgment

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 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. Of course, if you did do it, you might not admit it because it's uncomfortable. 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. 38 accounts in the complaint. I still have yet to have any acknowledgement of those claims of conspiracy against Chris Roller. I assumed this was a provable methodology, but I wanted to this further my method of discovery. You see, I made the motion for partial summary judgment to help provide evidence of the conspiracy. I did it to prove one item of the conspiracy. I still have 37 claims

available, but trying to kill me seemed like something with value attached to it - \$trillion/hit. What I expected in the reply is "CIA did not try to kill you, Chris. Thus you have no claim." which would put my mind at ease. Instead I got, "I have no proof". You see, it's an interrogation method. Nobody is going to make a statement in a reply, "Yes a member of the CIA tried to kill you Chris Roller". What a defense does is avoid the question if the truth is uncomfortable, and sidetrack it with something else, like "jurisdiction", and "no proof". 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 38 claims of conspiracy. 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, "CIA tripped me.", I expect a statement of counter, "CIA 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.

This supernatural stuff is only discoverable via court oath. The hit isn't supernatural, but my defenses preventing the hit are. Also, "court oath" magic is supernatural and the ultimate truth because it dips into the supernatural truth. The real world is not quite ready for the supernatural even though it's occurring, and I suspect not good. The court, though, is ready to hear the supernatural. I need to

avoid dismissal and to open up discovery so I can find out from the CIA the weird stuff going on in this world. Is anybody concerned about the supernatural besides me?

I didn't respond to jurisdiction because of a simple oversight. This court has subject matter jurisdiction because it's a federal question - conspiracy, and a hit would be attempted murder conspiracy. Personal jurisdiction via CIA having enough contacts with the United States as a Whole.

Now that was my simple oversight. I assume the defense didn't see my accusation of trying to kill me. So please make a statement, "CIA did [did not] try to kill Chris Roller". This is truth under oath time. Tell me the CIA didn't do it, and it's the truth and I go away. Otherwise, it happened, and I have a claim to avoid dismissal and grant partial summary judgment.

CONCLUSION

The hit accusation remains undisputed. There was no statement denying my accusation because the hit occurred, and the defense is trying to side-step the ugly truth under oath. Similarly, there is no denial for the other 38 claims of conspiracy. I have a hard time believing people can try to kill me, and I can't get justice for that. I need discovery opened. The CIA has had a project opened to watch me for over 20 years now and I would like to know what they know. I oppose dismissal so that I may open up discovery and see what's weird in the world besides me. I would also like to see my 2 kids the CIA are hiding.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: __28 June 2007__

____s/_Christopher A. Roller__

Christopher Roller (pro se)

13150 Harriet Ave. S #273

Burnsville, MN 55337

952.239.6410