

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

CLERK'S OFFICE  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT

David Schied,

*Sui Juris Grievant*

Case No. 2:15-cv-11840

v.

Karen Khalil, et al

Judge: Avern Cohn

Defendants

**“WRIT FOR SHOW CAUSE” IN RESPONSE TO REPEATED FRAUDULENCE COMPOUNDED BY COURT CLERKS AND OTHER “JUDICIAL OFFICERS”; AND “ORDER TO STRIKE” DEFENDANT FILINGS AS A RESULT OF “REDFORD” AND “MMRMA” CO-DEFENDANTS WORKING “IN CONCERT” WITH “DOE #1” (JAMES MELLON) AND “DOE #2 (JEFFREY CLARK) TO FURTHER DEFRAUD THIS COURT UNDER CLAIM THAT GRIEVANT(S) WERE “SERVED” WITH “REDFORD DEFENDANTS’ MOTION SEEKING STAY OF SUBMISSIONS AND PROCEEDINGS...” WHEN NO SUCH SERVICE OCCURRED IN FACT, THUS WARRANTING THIS “ORDER TO STRIKE”**

and

**ORDER FOR COMPETENCY HEARING ON 91-YEAR OLD AVERN COHN ON HIS FAILURE TO RESPOND TO PREVIOUS “WRIT FOR THE JUDGE AVERN COHN TO SHOW CAUSE AND REASON FOR A 10-MONTH OBSTRUCTION OF GRIEVANTS’ FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO ACCESS THIS DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES... BY HIS PERSISTENT FAILURE TO ACT UPON REPORTS OF CRIMES COMMITTED BY DEFENDANTS’ ATTORNEYS AND UPON GRIEVANT REPORTING THE THEFT OF COURT DOCUMENTS BY CLERKS OF THE FEDERAL COURT IN MAY OF 2015”**

<sup>1</sup> "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.

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

CLERK'S OFFICE  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT

David Schied,

*Sui Juris Grievant*

Case No. 2:15-cv-11840

v.

Karen Khalil, et al

Judge: Avern Cohn

Defendants

**“WRIT FOR SHOW CAUSE” IN RESPONSE TO REPEATED FRAUDULENCE COMPOUNDED BY COURT CLERKS AND OTHER “JUDICIAL OFFICERS”; AND “ORDER TO STRIKE” DEFENDANT FILINGS AS A RESULT OF “REDFORD” AND “MMRMA” CO-DEFENDANTS WORKING “IN CONCERT” WITH “DOE #1” (JAMES MELLON) AND “DOE #2 (JEFFREY CLARK) TO FURTHER DEFRAUD THIS COURT UNDER CLAIM THAT GRIEVANT(S) WERE “SERVED” WITH “REDFORD DEFENDANTS’ MOTION SEEKING STAY OF SUBMISSIONS AND PROCEEDINGS...” WHEN NO SUCH SERVICE OCCURRED IN FACT, THUS WARRANTING THIS “ORDER TO STRIKE”**

and

**ORDER FOR COMPETENCY HEARING ON 91-YEAR OLD AVERN COHN ON HIS FAILURE TO RESPOND TO PREVIOUS “WRIT FOR THE JUDGE AVERN COHN TO SHOW CAUSE AND REASON FOR A 10-MONTH OBSTRUCTION OF GRIEVANTS’ FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO ACCESS THIS DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES... BY HIS PERSISTENT FAILURE TO ACT UPON REPORTS OF CRIMES COMMITTED BY DEFENDANTS’ ATTORNEYS AND UPON GRIEVANT REPORTING THE THEFT OF COURT DOCUMENTS BY CLERKS OF THE FEDERAL COURT IN MAY OF 2015”**

<sup>1</sup> "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.

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

CLERK'S OFFICE  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT

David Schied,

*Sui Juris Grievant*

Case No. 2:15-cv-11840

v.

Karen Khalil, et al

Judge: Avern Cohn

Defendants

**“WRIT FOR SHOW CAUSE” IN RESPONSE TO REPEATED FRAUDULENCE COMPOUNDED BY COURT CLERKS AND OTHER “JUDICIAL OFFICERS”; AND “ORDER TO STRIKE” DEFENDANT FILINGS AS A RESULT OF “REDFORD” AND “MMRMA” CO-DEFENDANTS WORKING “IN CONCERT” WITH “DOE #1” (JAMES MELLON) AND “DOE #2 (JEFFREY CLARK) TO FURTHER DEFRAUD THIS COURT UNDER CLAIM THAT GRIEVANT(S) WERE “SERVED” WITH “REDFORD DEFENDANTS’ MOTION SEEKING STAY OF SUBMISSIONS AND PROCEEDINGS...” WHEN NO SUCH SERVICE OCCURRED IN FACT, THUS WARRANTING THIS “ORDER TO STRIKE”**

and

**ORDER FOR COMPETENCY HEARING ON 91-YEAR OLD AVERN COHN ON HIS FAILURE TO RESPOND TO PREVIOUS “WRIT FOR THE JUDGE AVERN COHN TO SHOW CAUSE AND REASON FOR A 10-MONTH OBSTRUCTION OF GRIEVANTS’ FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO ACCESS THIS DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES... BY HIS PERSISTENT FAILURE TO ACT UPON REPORTS OF CRIMES COMMITTED BY DEFENDANTS’ ATTORNEYS AND UPON GRIEVANT REPORTING THE THEFT OF COURT DOCUMENTS BY CLERKS OF THE FEDERAL COURT IN MAY OF 2015”**

<sup>1</sup> "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.