

On 3/31/16 the Clerk of the Court refused to accept the attached
"Interrogatories"
"Notice" instead.

United States District Court
For The Eastern Division of Michigan
The Theodore Levin United States Courthouse
231 W. Lafayette
Detroit, MI 48226-2797

↳ **Notice Regarding Discovery Rules**

Please be advised that the District Court does not accept discovery material in accordance with **Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 Section (d)** and **Eastern District of Michigan Administrative Order 00-AO-080** :

Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d)

(d) FILING CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE: All papers after the complaint required to be served upon a party, together with a certificate of service, must be filed with the court within a reasonable time after service, **but disclosures under Rule 26(a)(1) or (2) and the following discovery requests and responses must not be filed until they are used in the proceeding or the court orders filing: (i) depositions, (ii) interrogatories, (iii) requests for documents or to permit entry upon land, and (iv) requests for admissions.**

Eastern District of Michigan Administrative Order 00-AO-080

It appearing that amendments to **Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d)**, which become effective December 1, 2000, do not permit filing deposition transcript when a party makes a written request regardless of whether the transcript would be used, and It further appearing that the Court will not have an opportunity to meet prior to December 1, 2000, **NOW THEREFORE IT IS ORDERED that LR 26.2(b)(3) and any reference to a written request for deposition transcript contained in LR 26.2(d) and the Comment are hereby repealed effective December 1, 2000.**

FOR THE COURT:


Chief Judge Lawrence P. Zankoff

← This "judge" has been named as a criminal and he died in 2015.

Please note that **"Discovery requests"** include deposition notices and **"Discovery responses"** include objections. [Please review *Fed. R. Civ. P. 30,31,33,34, and 36.*]

Your cooperation in this matter is appreciated. If there are any questions, please contact the **Clerk's Office** at **(313) 234-5005**.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES ¹
(FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, SOUTHERN DIVISION)

David Schied,

Sui Juris Grievant

Case No. 2:15-cv-11840

v.

Karen Khalil, et al

Judge: Avern Cohn

Defendants /

GRIEVANT DAVID SCHIED'S

FIRST INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR EXHIBITS

TO

DEFENDANT CHARTER COUNTY OF WAYNE

AND

THE INSURANCE COMPANY FOR THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

AND

AMERICAN INSURANCE GROUP, INC.

AND

MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL RISK MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

AND

**CORPORATION COUNSEL ANSWERING FOR ALL OF THE CO-DEFENDANTS
COLLECTIVELY KNOWN AS "THE (NAMED) REDFORD CO-DEFENDANTS"**

¹ "The term 'District Courts of the United States,' as used in the rules, without an addition expressing a wider connotation, has its historic significance. It describes the constitutional courts created under article 3 of the Constitution. Courts of the Territories are legislative courts, properly speaking, and are not District Courts of the United States. We have often held that vesting a territorial court with jurisdiction similar to that vested in the District Courts of the United States does not make it a 'District Court of the United States.'" *Mookini v. United States*, 303 U.S. 201 (1938) citing from *Reynolds v. United States*, 98 U.S. 145 , 154; *The City of Panama*, 101 U.S. 453 , 460; *In re Mills*, 135 U.S. 263, 268 , 10 S.Ct. 762; *McAllister v. United States*, 141 U.S. 174, 182 , 183 S., 11 S.Ct. 949; *Stephens v. Cherokee Nation*, 174 U.S. 445, 476 , 477 S., 19 S.Ct. 722; *Summers v. United States*, 231 U.S. 92, 101 , 102 S., 34 S.Ct. 38; *United States v. Burroughs*, 289 U.S. 159, 163 , 53 S. Ct. 574.

THE LEGAL STANDARD FOR RELEVANT DISCOVERY

The touchstone of all civil discovery is that the parties are entitled to unrestricted access to all sources of potentially relevant information. “*Mutual knowledge of all the relevant facts gathered by both parties is essential to proper litigation.*” Hickman v. Taylor, 329 U.S. 495, 507-508 (1947). Rule 26(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that “[p]arties may obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, which is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action,” without regard to whether the material sought will be admissible at trial, “if the information sought appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.” “[R]elevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action' -- has been construed broadly to encompass any matter that bears on, or that reasonably could lead to other matter that could bear on, any issue that is or may be in the case.” Oppenheimer Fund, Inc. v. Sanders, 437 U.S. 340, 351 (1978). Relevancy “should be construed liberally and with common sense, rather than in terms of narrow legalisms.” Wright, Miller & Marcus, Federal Practice and Procedure § 2008 at 107 (2d ed. 1994).

Therefore, discovery should ordinarily be allowed as relevant unless it is clear that the information sought can have no possible bearing upon the subject matter of the action. Snowden v. Connaught Laboratories, Inc., 137 F.R.D. 325, 329 (D. Kan. 1991) (citing, Hoeme v. Golden Corral Corp., No. 89-1530 (D. Kan. June, 1990)) Gagne v. Reddy, 104 F.R.D. 454, 456 (D. Mass. 1984) (citing, Miller v. Doctor's General Hospital, 76 F.R.D. 136, 139 (W.D. Okla. 1977)); Roesberg v. Johns-Manville Corp., 85 F.R.D. 292, 296 (E.D. Pa. 1980).

An area of dispute that affects all of the pending discovery in this case is the relevant time period. It is well established that, where a conspiracy is alleged, as here, Grievants and Claimants are entitled to discovery for the full temporal scope of the alleged conspiracy regardless of the limitations period or the class period. See, e.g., FTC v. Lukens Steel Co., 444 F. Supp. 803, 805-806 (D.D.C. 1977); Bonus Oil Co. v. American Petrofina Co., 1975-1 Trade Cas. (CCH) ¶ 60,267 at 66,028-29 (D. Neb. 1975); Sandee Mfg. Co. v. Rohm & Haas Co., 24 F.R.D. 53, 57 (N.D. Ill. 1959); Rosseau v. Langley, 7 F.R.D. 170, 172 (S.D.N.Y. 1945).

In addition to discovery covering the years of the alleged conspiracy, Grievants and Claimants are entitled to discovery for reasonable periods of time pre-dating and post-dating the alleged conspiracy (in this case, 2004 to the present). See, e.g., In re Folding Carton Antitrust Litig., 83 F.R.D. 251 (N.D. Ill. 1978) (discovery allowed for several years beyond the alleged

conspiracy period as relevant to the existence of the alleged conspiracy and the determination of damages); *Goldinger v. Boron Oil* corporate defendants to identify all present and former directors, officers and individuals involved in bidding). See also, *In re Prudential Ins. Co. of America Sales Practices Litig.*, 962 F. Supp. 450, 481 (D.N.J. 1997); *In re ML-Lee Acquisition Fund II, L.P.*, 151 F.R.D. 37, 40 (D.Del. 1993); *Held v. National R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 101 F.R.D. 420, 427 (D.D.C. 1984).

INTERROGATORIES FOR ALL TO ANSWER

NOTE: In answering the questions below, please break down your answers separately and respectively for the years 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016.

- 1) Do you have county and/or township officers, employees, assigned guardians, clerks, treasurers, constables, purchasing agents, commissioners, county auditors, deputies, register of deeds, directors, legal counsel, secretaries, board members, chief executive officers, board members, school board members, magistrates, bailiffs, police officers, court reporters, attorneys, prosecuting attorneys, or other personnel who are required by the state constitution, state laws, and/or county ordinances to maintain Oaths and Bonds in guarantee and surety on their “honesty,” their “faithful discharge” and/or performance of their respective duties of office and/or employment?
- 2) If answering “yes” to #1 above, name each person required to have such oaths and bonds and given the location where each can be found and provide proof by copies of only their bonds.
- 3) If answering “no” to #1 above, name each person so employed in any of the above-listed positions being employed by the county and/or township without such a bond in guarantee of their oath and as surety against their “honesty,” their “faithful discharge” and/or performance of their respective duties of office and/or employment.

- 4) If answering “no” to #1 above, give the reason for each person not complying with the state constitution, state statutes and/or county ordinances and provide proofs to support your answers.
- 5) In lieu of any individual bonds required by state laws to be provided by any or all of the above-named officers and employees of the county and/or township as depicted by #1 above, do you have any “blanket” bonds covering any portion of those named employment positions?
- 6) If answering “yes” to #5 above, provide the name and holding location of each such “blanket” bond and for each bond, give the names of all such persons covered in surety on their honesty, faithful discharge of duties, and performance.
- 7) If answering “yes” to #5 above, provide the name of the surety company providing issuance of such blanket bonds and the respective dates of such issuance.
- 8) If answering “yes” to #5 above, provide copies of each such “blanket” bonds.
- 9) Does your county or township have any “self-funded” and/or third party “excess” or other type of insurance policies that guarantee or provide surety to the taxpayers and/or others to whom oaths, honesty, and faithful discharge of duties, and performance is to be held accountable?
- 10) If answering “yes” to #5 above, provide the name and holding location of each such policy and for each policy, give the names of all such persons covered in surety on their honesty, faithful discharge of duties, and performance.

- 11) If answering “yes” to #5 above, provide the name of the surety company providing issuance of such policies and the respective dates of such issuance.
- 12) If answering “yes” to #5 above, provide copies of each such policies.
- 13) If answering “no” to the above, does your county or township have any “self-funded” and/or third party “excess” or other type of insurance policies that indemnify any of the categories of officers and employees cited in #1 above against claims or court findings and/or rulings determining “tort,” “errors and omissions”, or any other form of “liability” without providing any guarantees directly to the taxpayers for such types of breaches of “faithful” discharge and performance of duties in accordance with those officers’ and employees’ oath of office?
- 14) If you answered “yes” to #13 above, please provide copies of all such “self-funded” or third-party insurance policies.
- 15) For each of the years cited above (2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016) has anyone placed or filed any claims – or attempted to place or file any claims – against any of the above categories of individual bonds, blanket bonds, or insurance policies based upon reports, notifications or other forms of communication indicating any level of violation of any officer or employee’s Oath, faithful discharge or performance of duties?
- 16) If you answered “yes” to #15 above, provide the names of all such individual placing or filing such claims.
- 17) If you answered “yes” to #15 above, provide claim numbers for each of the claims successfully established and explain how each was resolved.

- 18) If you answered “yes” to #15 above, provide full explanations for each of the claims that were thwarted or otherwise not established with a claim number, and how those attempts to place or file such claims were resolved or left unresolved.
- 19) For each of the years cited above (2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016) has anyone filed any court cases in local district court, county circuit court, or in federal court citing any form of violation of officers’ or employees’ breach of trust, violation of oath, faithful discharge of duties, or performance such as by claims of physical abuse, wrongful death, tort, misfeasance or malfeasance, or other forms of liability?
- 20) If you answered “yes” to #19 above, provide case numbers, case captions, name of the judge or judges assigned to the cases, names of the litigants, the contact information for all parties to these cases, and the outcome of the case, including amounts of awards issued by the court(s).
- 21) If you answered “yes” to #19 above, state (in writing) the outcome of each of those itemized cases.
- 22) If you answered “yes” to #19 above, provide the name of all parties involved in any out-of-court settlements and the names of all cases which have been “sealed” or otherwise undisclosed of the terms by which such cases were resolved.
- 23) If you answered “yes” to #19 above, were any “claims” made upon bonds, blanket bonds, or insurance policies as part of or an aftermath result of the resolve of such claims and/or rulings against officers and/or employees performance?

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS SPECIFICALLY FOR PLUNKETT-COONEY
ATTORNEYS AND THEIR CLIENTS

The Evidence submitted along with other filings “served” upon you and your clients along with these “Interrogatories” show that, in Krystal Price’s case which was assigned Claim #030314346, that Michael Creamer, Jim Drake, and Robert Ulrich, all maintaining “AIG” email addresses and none identifying themselves as officers or employees of the Insurance Company for the State of Pennsylvania.

- 24) For each of the above-named individuals, being Creamer, Drake and Ulrich, provide the current position, the company employing each, and the last 10 years of employment history, or as far back as the time in which they were first employed AIG and/or any of its “shell” company, subsidiaries, or associate enterprises.
- 25) For each of the above-named individuals, being Creamer, Drake and Ulrich, how many other claims numbers have been directly issued, directly assigned to others for processing, or directly investigated or resolved by Creamer, by Drake, and by Ulrich?
- 26) Is Julie Ulrich-Barrueco in any way a blood-relative of Robert Ulrich?
- 27) What is the employment background of Julie Ulrich-Barrueco, before and after her name change, as it pertains to all history of her employment as an attorney, and as it pertains to all history of her employment with the AIG conglomerate of companies, affiliates, subsidiaries, and/or shell companies?
- 28) Why did each of Michael Creamer, Jim Drake, and Robert Ulrich appear to be assigning Krystal Price’s case “up” the chain of commands to Julie Ulrich, an attorney in New York, rather than to claims adjusters employed by the Insurance Company for the State of Pennsylvania (“ICSOP”) as Plunkett-Cooney attorneys claim, and the evidence shows, that the policy issued between the Charter County of Wayne and “ICSOP”?

29) Was the assignment of Krystal Price's claim number unusual in any way, or are there written policies and practices set into place governing how claim numbers and claim processing against policies are issued claim numbers and managed?

30) If there are written policies in place on how claims are to be managed by ANY of the companies named as affiliated with AIG, as named by the Plunkett-Cooney's filing of "Motion for Summary Judgment," provide copies of all such policies and procedures from each company.

*** TO ALL PARTIES: Please provide all documents that support your answers to the above within 30 days of today's date; and be sure to label each "exhibit" as being supportive of which answers to which they are to be applied in support.**

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "David Schied".

David Schied

3/31/16