

**United States District Court  
District of Minnesota**

Christopher Roller  
(Plaintiff)

vs.

United States  
(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 George Bush (GB) authorized a hit against me every military facet possible. Also, the VA tried to kill me many times while caged up on a 72-hour hold starting 1May2007. These allegation is made fact via the "fess-up" phenomenon (truth serum) which prevents people from lying to me with a false statement. George Bush and the VA just needs to deny these allegations, and I rescind the motion.

The VA attempt was fairly complicated. The staff, aware that I am God, was trying to poison me to kill me. Also, they roomed me with a guy that was trying to physically kill me but couldn't even get to the batters box. These attempts leave no evidence but the truth under oath. I was never poisoned because of my magic, and nobody even came close to me physically because there is a force keeping people in check. The VA was a catch 22. If I would've accused anybody at the VA of this behavior, then would not have let me out, as accusing people of trying to kill is what got me caged up in the first place, when I tried to report Aimco, my

landlords, to the police, who then caged me.

Understand, I'm accusing GB/VA of trying to kill me. I'm also accusing military factions of trying to kill me. Make a statement denying it and I go away. Please make a direct statement like, "George Bush/VA did [did not] try to kill Chris Roller as a result of this law suit".

Don't want to hear this is not proof. The truth is the proof. If somebody robbed me and then sold everything, leaving no evidence, all the evidence that remains is the truth of the accused under oath. Simple interrogation. I ask the robber and if he doesn't deny it, he did it. 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 "GB/VA 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 VA 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, "George Bush tripped me.", I expect a statement of counter, "George Bush 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, "George Bush/VA did try to kill Chris Roller as a result of this law suit". This is truth under oath time. Tell me that George Bush 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.

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

"George Bush did not try to kill Chris Roller with aid of military factions as a result of this law suit. Also the VA did not try to kill Chris Roller during his 1May2007 caging."

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 such

that people be apprehended for trying to harm me.

## CONCLUSION

For reasons stated above, Chris Roller is asking for partial summary judgment such that people be apprehended for trying to harm me.

Date: \_\_6 Aug 2007\_\_

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