

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 /

PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERALS (“PAGs”) DAVID SCHIED’S
AND CORNELL SQUIRES’ “REPLY”
TO
ATTORNEYS JAMES MELLON’S, CHARLES BROWNING’S AND WARREN WHITE’S
FRAUDULENT “RESPONSES” ON BEHALF OF
THE MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL RISK MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY’S (“MMRMA’S”),
AND PLUNKETT-COONEY LAW FIRM’S CLIENTS OF “ISCOP” AND “AIG’S”
TO
GRIEVANTS/PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERALS (“PAGs”)
DAVID SCHIED’S AND CORNELL SQUIRES’
“NOTICE TO THIS ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD OF ENJOINMENT OF OTHERS
SIMILARLY SITUATED BY THIRD PARTY INTERVENING, ‘NEXT FRIEND’
RELATIONSHIP AND CRIME VICTIM ADVOCACY; WITH SUPPORTING
‘MEMORANDUM OF LA W’” (DKT. #109)”
AND
ORDER FOR NAMING CHARLES BROWNING AND WARREN WHITE
AS “DOE #3” AND “DOE #4” RESPECTIVELY

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.

*Sui Juris Grievants / Next Friends and
Co-Private Attorney Generals
David Schied and Cornell Squires*

P.O. Box 1378
Novi, Michigan 48376
248-974-7703

Defendants

**The Insurance Company of the
State of Pennsylvania**

AND

American International Group, Inc.
Plunkett Cooney
Charles Browning
Warren White
38505 Woodward Ave., Suite 2000
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304
248-901-4000

Defendants

**Michigan Municipal Risk
Management Authority**
James T. Mellon
Mellon Pries, P.C.
2150 Butterfield Dr., Ste. 100
Troy, Michigan 48084-3427
248-649-1330

Defendant

Charter County of Wayne

Davidde A. Stella
Zenna Elhasan
Wayne County Corporation Counsel
500 Griswold St., 11th Floor
Detroit, Michigan 48226
313-224-5030

Defendants

**Karen Khalil
Redford Township 17th District Court
Cathleen Dunn
John Schipani
Redford Township Police Department
Joseph Bommarito
James Turner
David Holt
Jonathan Strong
"Police Officer" Butler
Tracey Schultz-Kobylarz
Charter Township of Redford
DOES 1-10**

Jeffrey Clark, attorney
Cummings, McClorey, Davis & Acho, P.L.C.
33900 Schoolcraft Rd.
Livonia, Michigan 48150
734-261-2400

David Schied and Cornell Squires (hereinafter “PAGs Schied and Squires”), being each **of the People**², and having established this case as a *suit of the sovereign*³, acting in their own capacity, herein accept for value the oaths⁴ and

² PEOPLE. “*People are supreme, not the state.*” [*Waring vs. the Mayor of Savannah*, 60 Georgia at 93]; “*The state cannot diminish rights of the people.*” [*Hertado v. California*, 100 US 516]; Preamble to the US and Michigan Constitutions – “*We the people ... do ordain and establish this Constitution...*,” “*...at the Revolution, the sovereignty devolved on the people; and they are truly the sovereigns of the country, but they are sovereigns without subjects...with none to govern but themselves...*” [*Chisholm v. Georgia* (US) 2 Dall 419, 454, 1 L Ed 440, 455, 2 Dall (1793) pp471-472]: “*The people of this State, as the successors of its former sovereign, are entitled to all the rights which formerly belonged to the King by his prerogative.*” [*Lansing v. Smith*, 4 Wend. 9 (N.Y.) (1829), 21 Am. Dec. 89 10C Const. Law Sec. 298; 18 C Em.Dom. Sec. 3, 228; 37 C Nav.Wat. Sec. 219; Nuls Sec. 167; 48 C Wharves Sec. 3, 7]. See also, *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, 60 U.S. 393 (1856) which states: “*The words 'people of the United States' and 'citizens' are synonymous terms, and mean the same thing. They both describe the political body who, according to our republican institutions, form the sovereignty, and who hold the power and conduct the Government through their representatives. They are what we familiarly call the 'sovereign people', and every citizen is one of this people, and a constituent member of this sovereignty.*”

³ *McCullock v. Maryland*, 4 Wheat 316, 404, 405, states “*In the United States, Sovereignty resides in the people, who act through the organs established by the Constitution,*” and *Colten v. Kentucky* (1972) 407 U.S. 104, 122, 92 S. Ct. 1953 states; “*The constitutional theory is that we the people are the sovereigns, the state and federal officials only our agents.*” See also, *First Trust Co. v. Smith*, 134 Neb.; 277 SW 762, which states in pertinent part, “*The theory of the American political system is that the ultimate sovereignty is in the people, from whom all legitimate authority springs, and the people collectively, acting through the medium of constitutions, create such governmental agencies, endow them with such powers, and subject them to such limitations as in their wisdom will best promote the common good.*”

⁴ OATHS. Article VI: “*This Constitution, and the laws of the United States... shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby; anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding... All executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and*

bonds of all the officers of this court, including attorneys. Having already presented the initial causes of action to this Article III District Court of the United States as a *court of record*⁵, *PAG Schied* and *PAG Squires* hereby proceed according to the course of Common Law⁶.

This court and the opposing parties should all take notice **WE DO NOT CONSENT to the reference of parties named as “grievants” and/or as Private Attorney Generals as otherwise being corporate fictions in ALL CAPS of lettering as “plaintiff”** (e.g., “DAVID SCHIED, plaintiff”). **Note that all “summons” were issued with notice to all co-Defendants that Grievant David Schied is “sui juris.”**

of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution."

⁵ "A Court of Record is a judicial tribunal having attributes and exercising functions independently of the person of the magistrate designated generally to hold it, and proceeding according to the course of common law, its acts and proceedings being enrolled for a perpetual memorial". [*Jones v. Jones*, 188 Mo.App. 220, 175 S.W. 227, 229; *Ex parte Gladhill*, 8 Metc. Mass., 171, per Shaw, C.J. See also, *Ledwith v. Rosalsky*, 244 N.Y. 406, 155 N.E. 688, 689].

⁶ COMMON LAW. – According to *Black’s Law Dictionary* (Abridged Sixth Edition, 1991): “As distinguished from law created by the enactment of legislatures [admiralty], the common law comprises the body of those principles and rules of action, relating to the government and security of persons and property, which derive their authority solely from usages and customs of immemorial antiquity, or from the judgments and decrees of the courts recognizing, affirming, and enforcing such usages and customs.” “[I]n this sense, particularly the ancient unwritten law of England.” [1 Kent, Comm. 492. *State v. Buchanan*, 5 Har. & J. (Md.) 3G5, 9 Am. Dec. 534; *Lux v. Ilaggin*, G9 Cal. 255, 10 Pac. G74; *Western Union Tel. Co. v. Call Pub. Co.*, 21 S.Ct. 561, 181 U.S. 92, 45 L.Ed. 765; *Barry v. Port Jervis*, 72 N.Y.S. 104, 64 App. Div. 268; *U. S. v. Miller*, D.C. Wash., 236 F. 798, 800.]

WE DO NOT CONSENT to the assignment of this case, otherwise attempted to be “*filed*” in Ann Arbor and ultimately filed in Flint, being subsequently sent to Detroit, in the heart of Wayne County, situated in a building believed to be leased by Defendant Charter County of Wayne to the United States District Court with a proven proclivity toward contributing to the *domestic terrorism* being carried out, hand-in-hand with state and county government imposters, as usurpers of *The People’s* power and authority.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary overview as the basis for this filing.....1

General objections against both of the co-defendants’ “Response” filings.....2

Objections against both of the co-Defendants’ “Response” filings
Based on specific instances of FRAUD by gross omissions
by named “DOES #3 and #4” (Browning and White).....6

Conclusion and Order of Relief.....9

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES

UNITED STATES

Constitution, Article III.....1 – 5

Statutes at Large.....9

Common Law.....1, 3, 6, 9

OTHER

Previously filed “Memorandum of Law”1, 9, 10

CONCISE STATEMENTS OF THE ISSUES PRESENTED

- 1) Whether the acts of *constructive fraud*, *fraud by omissions*, and *other acts* of co-Defendants and their attorneys, as reflected in their filings and called out as such by Grievant/PAG Schied (and now Grievant/PAG Squires) vitiates and invalidates their acts, and warrants that further civil and criminal actions be taken against a “*pattern and practice*” of that “*representative*” attorneys that mimics the acts of “*domestic terrorism*” alleged against their clients for “*coercion*” of a populace and the “*government*” by “*fraud upon th[is] court.*”
- 2) Whether the Grievants/PAGs David Schied and Cornell Squires have validity and supporting laws as provided by their filing of a 50-page “*Memorandum of Law*” that the co-Defendants have completely and conspicuously ignored, and are acting lawfully and appropriately – in the interest of the public – when filing their first set of additional fourteen (14) “*joinder*” cases of “*similarly situated*” Grievants/Claimants/Crime Victims of “*domestic terrorism.*”

CONTROLLING OR MOST APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY FOR RELIEF

The previous-filed 50-page “*Memorandum of Law*” that was completely and conspicuously ignored by the co-Defendants

SUMMARY OVERVIEW AS THE BASIS FOR THIS FILING

Sui Juris Grievants and Private Attorney Generals David Schied and Cornell Squires, acting under Common Law and in this instant Article III Court of Record, do hereby submit this “Reply” to the filing of Defendants’ attorney James Mellon’s “Response” on behalf of the Michigan Municipal Risk Management Authority (“MMRMA”) and Charles Browning’s and Warren White’s “Response” on behalf of Defendants The Insurance Company of the State of Pennsylvania (and American International Group – to the previous “joinder” filing of:

“Grievants/Private Attorney Generals (“PAGs”) David Schied’s and Cornell Squires’ ‘Notice to this Article III Court of Record of Enjoinment of Others Similarly Situated by Third Party Intervening, ‘Next Friend’ Relationship and Crime Victim Advocacy with Supporting ‘MEMORANDUM OF LAW of Law’”

(referred to by co-Defendants as “(DKT. #109)”)”)

As provided on the cover page of this instant “Reply” document, Grievants/PAG’s David Schied and Cornell Squires assert that the “Response” filings of the referenced co-Defendants and their respective attorneys – being James Mellon, Charles Browning and Warren White – are blatantly fraudulent, and as such should be stricken, and with these attorneys jailed for criminal fraud upon the court, and their law firms and clients heavily sanctioned for their endorsing and paying these attorneys to commit these types of racketeering crimes.

**GENERAL OBJECTIONS AGAINST BOTH OF THE
CO-DEFENDANTS’ “RESPONSE” FILINGS**

This “Reply” is based upon a plethora of Evidence – already well-established as matters of the official Court of Record – that attorneys Mellon, Browning and White have committed numerous counts of FRAUD upon this federal court and that their respective law firms are co-conspirator and co-racketeers and domestic terrorists engaging in numerous criminal violations of federal laws along with their clients.

Specifically, Grievants/PAGs Schied and Squires incorporate and reassert herein, as if stated verbatim and admitted herein along with the referenced evidence, the same assertions that have been previously made about James Mellon and these Plunkett-Cooney attorneys (Browning and White) in the following documents filed in this case and in this Article III Court of Record as referenced by the following Internet web-pages:

- 1) “Private Attorney Generals David Schied’s and Cornell Squires’ ‘Response’ and ‘Objections’ to Co-Defendants ‘MMRMA’s’ and ‘Redford’s’ Respective ‘Objections’ and ‘Response’ to Grievant’s ‘First Interrogatories’ and ‘Grievants’ Writ to Disqualify MMRMA and ‘Redford’ Attorneys James Mellon and Jeffrey Clark Based Upon (Respectively) ‘Fraud Upon the Court’ and ‘Conflict of Interest’ and “Reiterating the Naming of James Mellon as ‘Defendant DOE #1’ and Notice of Naming Jeffrey Clark as ‘Defendant DOE #2’” (recently filed in the Article III U.S. District Court of Record on 5/16/16) and found online in the official Article III Court of Record at: – (http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEdM/051616_Objections&ResponsestoJoinders/FilingsofPAGsSchied&Squires/Respons2ClarkRedfordObjecttoDiscovery.pdf)

- 2) “Grievant David Schied’s ‘Reply’ in Denial of MMRMA Attorney(s) James Mellon and Mellon Pries, P.C.’s Fraudulent ‘Response’ to Grievant’s ‘Writ of Error for Assignment of Magistrate and Engagement of Ex-Parte Proceedings and Mandamus for Proceeding in Common Law Under the Constitution in an Article III Court of Record’ Based Upon Repeated ‘Fraud Upon the Court’ by Attorney Mellon with Proof of Such Fraud by ‘Prima Facie’ Evidence Provided Again Herein” filed on or about 9/2/15 (referenced perhaps by Defendant as “Docket 72”) and found online in the official Article III Court of Record at – http://cases.michigan.constitutional.gov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/081815_MyWritofError4AssignofMagistrate/MMRMAResponsetoMyWritofError/MyReply2MellonResponse&EvidenceofFRAUD/EntireReplytoFraudResponseofMellon2WritofError.pdf

- 3) “Grievant’s Combined ‘Response’ and ‘Reply’ to Attorney James Mellon’s and Mellon Pries, P.C.’s Fraudulent Conveyances in Their ‘Motion to Dismiss in Lieu of Answer’ and their ‘MMRMA’s Response to Plaintiff’s ‘Writ’ for Change of Judge Based on Conflict of Interest and Change of Venue Based on ‘Proven’ History of Corruption’ on Behalf of Defendant Michigan Municipal Risk Management Authority” filed on 7/15/15 as probable “Docket #38” and found online in the official Article III Court of Record at – http://cases.michigan.constitutional.gov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/071415_MyResponse2MMRMA1stMot2Dismiss/071415_MyResponse2Mot2DismissinLieuofAnswer/Response2Mot2Dismiss_EntireFinal.pdf

- 4) “Grievant’s Objections and Order to Strike ‘Defendant, The Insurance Company of the State of Pennsylvania (‘ICSOP’) and American International Group, Inc.s (‘AIG’s’) ‘Answer’ to ‘Plaintiff’s Complaint’ Based on a Pattern of Gross Omissions, Intentional Deception, Frivolous Filing, and Obstruction of Justice (Under F.R.C.P. Rule 11) and for Summary Judgment and/or Declaratory Ruling and Sanctions Against Defendants’ Intentional Failure to Answer Within 20 Days (as required by F.R.C.P. Rule 56a)” filed on 7/31/15 as probable “Docket #58” and found online in the official Article III Court of Record at – http://cases.michigan.constitutional.gov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/073115MyOrder2StrikeAIG&ICSOPNoSignPlunkCoony/Order2Strike&SummJudgmt.pdf

- 5) “Grievant’s ‘Replacement of ‘Stricken’ First ‘Reply’ to Attorney James Mellon and Mellon Pries, P.C.’s Fraudulent Conveyances in Their ‘MMRMA Response to Plaintiff’s ‘Writ’ for Change of...Venue on ‘Proven’ History of Corruption” filed on 11/18/15 as probable “Docket #84” as located online in the official Article III Court of Record at – http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/111815_RefiledDocsStrickenbyMagistrate/ReplaceReply2MMRMAFraudResponse2MyWrit4ChangeVenue/EntireRefileMyReply2MMRMAResp2Writ4ChangeVenue.pdf

- 6) “Grievant’s Replacement of ‘Stricken’ First Response to Attorney James Mellon and Mellon Pries, P.C.’s Fraudulent Conveyances in their ‘Motion to Dismiss in Lieu of Answer”” filed on 11/18/15 as probable “Docket #85” as located online in the official Article III Court of Record at http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/111815_RefiledDocsStrickenbyMagistrate/ReplaceStrickenResponse2MMRMAMot2DismissinLieuofAnswr/EntireRefileResp2MMRMADismissinLieuofAnsr.pdf

- 7) “Grievant’s ‘Replacement of ‘Stricken’ First Objections and Order to Strike ‘Defendant, The Insurance Company of the State of Pennsylvania (‘ICSOP’) and American International Group, Inc.s (‘AIG’s’) ‘Answer’ to ‘Plaintiff’s Complaint’ Based on a Pattern of Gross Omissions, Intentional Deception, Frivolous Filing, and Obstruction of Justice (Under F.R.C.P. Rule 11) and for Summary Judgment and/or Declaratory Ruling and Sanctions Against Defendants’ Intentional Failure to Answer Within 20 Days (as required by F.R.C.P. Rule 56a) filed on 11/18/15 as probable “Docket #82” as located online in the official Article III Court of Record at http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/111815_RefiledDocsStrickenbyMagistrate/ReplaceObject&Ordr2StrikeInsurCoAIGAnswr&Mot4SumJudgment/EntiretyofMyResubObjec&Order2StrikeInitialAnswersofISCOP&AIG.pdf

- 8) “Grievant’s Response to Attorney Mellon’s ‘Motion to Strike’ Grievant’s ‘Replacement Responses (DKT. ##81,82,83,84,85) and ‘Writ of Mandamus in Order of...Adding James Mellon as a Co-Defendant in This Case; and Sanctioning of Mellon, Barring From Further Filing in This Case, and in Crime Report Against Mellon and His Client MMRMA, by Reason of His Continued ‘Conspiracy’ With Defendant ‘MMRMA’ to Commit ‘Fraud Upon This Article

III Court” filed on 12/12/15 as probable “Docket #100” as located online in the official Article III Court of Record at http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/121215_MyResp2MellonMot2StrikeMyReplacementResponses/121215MyResp2MellonMot2StrikeReplRespon/121415_Resp&BriefinSupportinOppositionofMot2StrikeReplacFilings.pdf

- 9) “Grievant’s Response to Attorney Mellon’s ‘Motion to Strike’ Grievant’s ‘Response to ‘Grievant’s Response to Attorney Mellon’s ‘Motion to Strike’ Grievant’s ‘Replacement Responses (DKT. ##81,82,83,84,85) and ‘Writ of Mandamus in Order of...Adding James Mellon as a Co-Defendant in This Case; and Sanctioning of Mellon, Barring From Further Filing in This Case, and in Crime Report Against Mellon and His Client MMRMA, by Reason of His Continued ‘Conspiracy’ With Defendant ‘MMRMA’ to Commit ‘Fraud Upon This Article III Court’” filed on 12/24/15 as probable “Docket #102” as located online in the official Article III Court of Record at: http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/122415_MyResp2MellonMot2StrikeMyWritofError&ReverAssignMagis/FinalFilings/122415_Resp2MelMot2StrWritErrorMag.pdf
- 10) “Grievant’s Brief in Support of ‘Response to Attorney Mellon’s ‘Motion to Strike’ Grievant’s ‘Response to ‘Grievant’s Response to Attorney Mellon’s ‘Motion to Strike’ Grievant’s ‘Replacement Responses (DKT. ##81,82,83,84,85) and ‘Writ of Mandamus in Order of...Adding James Mellon as a Co-Defendant in This Case; and Sanctioning of Mellon, Barring From Further Filing in This Case, and in Crime Report Against Mellon and His Client MMRMA, by Reason of His Continued ‘Conspiracy’ With Defendant ‘MMRMA’ to Commit ‘Fraud Upon This Article III Court’” filed on 12/24/15 as probable “Docket #102” as located online in the official Article III Court of Record at: http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/122415_MyResp2MellonMot2StrikeMyWritofError&ReverAssignMagis/FinalFilings/122415_BriefSupporResp2MelMot2StrWritErrorMag.pdf

Importantly, the above-listed filings demonstrate that from the onset of this case Grievant had filed “*prima facie*” **documents of Evidence** in support of

claims that attorneys Mellon, Browning and White were committing numerous instances of FRAUD upon this Article III Court of Record, and thus justifying the disqualification of all of these attorneys henceforth as “*officers of the court.*”

In light of the overwhelming and **unrebutted** Evidence of FRAUD accompanying the above-referenced *prima facie* allegations on the cover pages of the above sets of filings, Grievants/PAGs Schied and Squires object to and DENY the entirety of the co-Defendants’ “*Response*” filings because they follow a longstanding pattern of civil contempt and criminal “*fraud*” upon this Article III common law Court of Record.

***“Fraud vitiates every transaction and all contracts. Indeed, the principle is often stated, in broad and sweeping language, that fraud destroys the validity of everything into which it enters” –
37 Am Jur 2d, Section 8***

“Fraud vitiates everything it touches.” (common law maxim)
Nudd v. Burrows, (1875) 91 U.S. 416

“Fraud destroys the validity of everything into which it enters.”
Boyce’s Executors v. Grundy (1830) 28 U.S. 210

“Fraud vitiates the most solemn contracts, documents and even judgments.” United States v. Throckmorton (1878) 98 U.S. 61, 70

**OBJECTIONS AGAINST BOTH OF THE CO-DEFENDANTS’
“RESPONSE” FILINGS BASED ON SPECIFIC INSTANCES OF
FRAUD BY GROSS OMISSIONS BY NAMED “DOES #3 AND #4”
(Browning and White)**

Attorney Mellon has already been named also as “DOE #1” in Grievant Schied’s previous filing dated 9/2/15 as cited above. This was reiterated in Grievant/PAG’s most recent filing, received by the Court on 5/16/16, as also cited above, in which the “*Redford*” Attorney Jeffrey was justifiably named as “DOE #2.” **Herein, for the reasons stated both above and below, attorneys Richard Browning and Warren White are named as “DOE #3” and “DOE #4” respectively.**

Grievants/PAGs Schied and Squires incorporate by reference the above-referenced filings, inclusive of all statements, arguments and evidence referenced in these documents, as they each reference the multitude of separate acts committed by James Mellon (“DOE #1”) constituting a sequence of fraudulent events and a history to prove that nothing submitted on behalf of co-Defendants by Mellon is to be deemed credible by fair comparison.

Notably Browning never has filed any “Notice of Appearance” in this instant Article III District Court of the United States case. He has thus been intentionally conspiring with his cohort, White, to deliberately mislead this court, in all filings thus far that have been submitted – in whole or in part – by Browning. (NOTE: White’s “Notice of Appearance” was filed as “DKT. #29”.) **This “objection” thus**

maintains that nothing filed with Browning's name on it in this case has been "recognized" as authored and/or submitted by Browning except under fraudulent pretenses.

Thus, Grievants/PAGs Schied and Squires object to the entirety the Plunket-Cooney crime syndicate as filed by Browning and White on behalf of Defendants "ISCOP" and "AIG" because Browning's name affixed to the document vitiates the entirety of the document by fraud. Schied and Squires further assert that Browning may NOT proceed any further as a "representative" attorney in this case due to his proven fraud upon this Article III Court of Record. He instead is to be under proper ORDER of being sanctioned for his fraud, cited for "contempt," and criminally jailed for the further fraud he has committed upon this Court by this latest filing which is chock full of gross omissions of relevant "facts."

Although there are many gross omissions of relevant FACTS in the statements and arguments of the co-Defendants as misrepresented to this Article III Court of Record, of the most relevant are the following facts:

- 1) That the co-Defendants never acknowledge that the original Complaint / Claim of Damages includes acts of "domestic terrorism" (see pp. 17, 25 and 45), and references allegations, affidavits and evidence that involve public functionaries employed by the Charter County of Wayne under contract for**

financial “*coverage*” for such acts that are alleged, giving incentive for these “*domestic terrorists*” named as the agents’ of the co-Defendants to believe they can find “*aid and comfort*” through that corporate contract, in carrying out such acts with the false belief that their agents’ *terrorist* acts against the public can be carried out with impunity.

- 2) That the co-Defendants never acknowledge that – *prima facie* – as written on the cover page of the “*joinder*” of at least fourteen (14) additional people in this instant case, these joinder cases were added by Grievant David Schied acting in the capacity of Private Attorney General along with co-PAG Cornell Squires, while acting in the “*interest of the public,*” and with an accompanying 50-page “*Memorandum of Law*” all clearly spelling out the legal justification for this joint action;
- 3) That the co-Defendant continue to deny, or fail to acknowledge that Grievants, PAGs, and “*Joinder*” Claimants, are acting in an Article III Court of Record under the Statutes at Large and in Common Law.

CONCLUSION AND ORDER OF RELIEF

The gross “*fraud by omissions*” and the long history of *constructive fraud* of the co-Defendants vitiates their filings implicates them for justifying civil sanctions and criminal charges for felony crimes, by which all attorneys and (especially) Article III judges privy to these FACTS are obliged under 18 U.S.C. §

4 (“*Misprision of Felony*”), and as “*officers of the court,*” to take appropriate action by their Oaths and Duties of office.

It is hereby ORDERED that the “joinder” claims added to this case be sustained as such, and that James Mellon be named in this case instead as “DOE #1,” that Jeffrey Clark be named as “DOE #2,” that Charles Browning be named as “DOE #3,” and that Warren White be named as “DOE #4.”

Given that the “*objection*” filing of the co-Defendants have at least acknowledged (i.e., see Browning and White’s “*Reply in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment*”) of Grievant/PAG Schied’s previous filing of a “*Writ for the judge Avern Cohn to Show Cause*” and that, to date the 91-year old Cohn has taken no action whatsoever – within the reasonable time that has long passed already – to present evidence against the likelihood that he is in some way “*incapacitated*” and committing misconduct in office by failing to address issues presented many months ago while allowing these issues to fester in a gross denial of Grievants’ “*First Amendment Right to Access*” this Article III federal court, **it is hereby ORDERED that Avern Cohn step down from his lifetime position as the Article III “judge” appointed to this case or be subject to an escalated cause of action against him.**

It is ORDERED that the “Memorandum of Law” supporting and justifying actions of PAGs and the Joinder Claimants be recognized as controlling.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "David Schied". The signature is written in dark ink on a light background.

David Schied

5/19/16