

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

David Schied and Cornell Squires,
Sui Juris Grievants/Private Attorney Generals
v.
Karen Khalil, et al

Case No. 2:15-cv-11840
Judge: Avern Cohn

Defendants /

PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERALS (“PAGs”)
DAVID SCHIED’S AND CORNELL SQUIRES’
“ORDER OF DEFAULT JUDGMENT

FILED
AUG 25 2016

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
FLINT, MICHIGAN

on
NUMEROUS UNREBUTTED CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS
AGAINST

DOES #1 THROUGH #4 (James Mellon, Jeffrey Clark, Warren White and Charles
“No Appearance” Browning) AND OTHER ACTS OF DERELICTION AND
‘CONSPIRACY TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT’ AS COMMITTED BETWEEN
6/30/16 AND 8/11/16 BY MAGISTRATE STEPHANIE DAVIS”

AND

“DENIAL OF ANY PROPOSED ‘SUBSTITUTION’ OF DEFENDANT ‘DOE’
CHARLES ‘No Appearance’ Browning FOR ‘DOE’ WARREN WHITE AS
ATTORNEY ‘REPRESENTATING’ CO-DEFENDANTS ‘AIG’ AND ‘ICSOP’

AND

‘OBJECTION’ TO ‘CRIMINALLY ACCUSED’ STEPHANIE DAVIS’
‘REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION’ SUA SPONTE DISMISSAL AND
TERMINATION OF ALL (9) PENDING MOTIONS’ BASED ON ‘MORE FRAUD’”

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.

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

David Schied and Cornell Squires,
Sui Juris Grievants/Private Attorney Generals
v.
Karen Khalil, et al

Case No. 2:15-cv-11840
Judge: Avern Cohn

Defendants /

PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERALS (“PAGs”)
DAVID SCHIED’S AND CORNELL SQUIRES’
“ORDER OF DEFAULT JUDGMENT

on

NUMEROUS UNREBUTTED CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS
AGAINST

DOES #1 THROUGH #4 (James Mellon, Jeffrey Clark, Warren White and Charles
“No Appearance” Browning) AND OTHER ACTS OF DERELICTION AND
‘CONSPIRACY TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT’ AS COMMITTED BETWEEN
6/30/16 AND 8/11/16 BY MAGISTRATE STEPHANIE DAVIS”

AND

“DENIAL OF ANY PROPOSED ‘SUBSTITUTION’ OF DEFENDANT ‘DOE’
CHARLES ‘No Appearance’ Browning FOR ‘DOE’ WARREN WHITE AS
ATTORNEY ‘REPRESENTATING’ CO-DEFENDANTS ‘AIG’ AND ‘ICSOP’

AND

‘OBJECTION’ TO ‘CRIMINALLY ACCUSED’ STEPHANIE DAVIS’
‘REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION’ SUA SPONTE DISMISSAL AND
TERMINATION OF ALL (9) PENDING MOTIONS’ BASED ON ‘MORE FRAUD’”

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.

HERE COMES Grievants/Claimants and Private Attorney Generals, David Schied and Cornell Squires, acting in their own interest, in the interest of at least fourteen (14) “*joinder*” Grievants/Claimants, and in the public’s best interest, to address the grossly fraudulent actions taken by “*judicial usurper*” Stephanie Davis in treasonous effort to criminally “*aid and abet*” her fellow State BAR of Michigan members in the cover-up of domestic terrorism in the region of American known by its territorial boundaries as “*Wayne County,*” otherwise under the control and operation of the incorporated co-Defendants “*Charter County of Wayne.*”

*** NOTE: David Schied and Cornell Squires reserve all rights to modify this document in any fashion that they deem is needed.**

CONCISE STATEMENTS OF “OBJECTION” AND “FINAL NOTICE” OF “NO CONSENT” TO WHAT STEPHANIE DAVIS HAS DONE, IS DOING AND TO WHAT SHE PROPOSES TO DO

This Article III Court of Record hereby is put on notice that the following comports with the rationale that “*failure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of any further right of appeal.*” This rationale also comports with the Common Law maxim stating, “*He who does not deny, admits.*” Hence, the fact that at least forth-two (42) sworn and notarized UNREBUTTED Affidavits have long been entered into this case – including one entered as a CRIME REPORT naming Stephanie Davis as a criminal co-conspirator to domestic terrorism, and establishing a claim in commerce outlining certain damages which have resulted directly by her tortuous and treasonous actions. This record establishes that she has

thus far “*failed to file specific objections*” to TWO sworn and notarized *Affidavits* (of Cornell Squires and David Schied); and thus, Stephenie Davis “*waives any further right to appeal*” those allegations, as reaffirmed and repeated, in part, herein.

Moreover, by reference to the previous filings of this case, both above and below, it is perpetually noted that “*objection*” “*denial*”, and or the “*denial of consent*” has already been issued on numerous occasions giving clear prior NOTICE to Davis that – in this Article III Court of Record – her “*Article I administrative*” presence is *unwanted, denied, and without consent* of all parties; for just the reasons found at this moment in this case, and as found earlier in this case with the unlawful actions taken by the former “*magistrate*” Michael Hluchaniuk, who no longer is on this case and no longer is even under employ at the United States District Court (i.e., he was “*retired*” immediately after a “*Writ of Mandamus for Interlocutory Appeal*” and an accompanying “*Memorandum at Law*” was filed in opposition to his corruptive and criminal acts to obstruct justice in this case). Hence, Davis’ actions since those notices were issued are a legal *nullity* except in supplying evidence of her “*aiding and abetting*” in criminal racketeering and corruption as a member of a widespread “*domestic terrorist*” network subject to criminal prosecution and other forms of penalties and remedies in commerce.

1. Grievants/Claimants and PAG’s David Schied and Cornell Squires, and all those “*others enjoined*” together as Grievants/Claimants, categorically DENY, OBJECT, and DO NOT CONSENT to the entirety of Stephanie Davis’ “Section I: Procedural History” based upon numerous “*frauds by omissions of specific facts*” and “*abuse of official power and authority by misapplication of the laws.*” Evidence of such frauds and abuses is provided by **“EXHIBIT A”** and **“EXHIBIT B”** attached herein and respectively captioned as follows:
 - a) **“EXHIBIT A”** – “Sworn Follow-Up Affidavit and Crime Report of David Schied in Report on 8/22/16 of Additional Crimes Committed by Magistrate Stephanie Davis, Who is Working as a ‘Domestic Terrorist’ Along with Other U.S. District Court Judges, Clerks and Magistrates Under Employ in the Eastern District of Michigan and in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit to Coerce the People and the Government of this District;” (26 pages)
 - b) **“EXHIBIT B”** – “Memorandum on Rights of (We,) ‘The People’: To Assemble; to Local Governance; and to Withdraw ‘Consent’ Through State and Federal Jury Nullification, Through Grand Jury Presentments, Through Private Prosecutions, and Through Other Executions of Customary Law and the Laws of Commerce.” (165 pages)
2. Grievants/Claimants and PAG’s David Schied and Cornell Squires, and all those “*others enjoined*” together as Grievants/Claimants, categorically DENY, OBJECT, and DO NOT CONSENT to the entirety of Stephanie Davis’ “Section II: Plaintiff’s Complaint” based upon numerous “*frauds by omissions of specific facts*” and “*abuse of official power and authority by misapplication of the laws.*” Evidence of such frauds and abuses is provided by **“EXHIBIT A”** and **“EXHIBIT B”** attached herein and respectively captioned as follows:

- c) **“EXHIBIT A”** – “Sworn Follow-Up Affidavit and Crime Report of David Schied in Report on 8/22/16 of Additional Crimes Committed by Magistrate Stephanie Davis, Who is Working as a ‘Domestic Terrorist’ Along with Other U.S. District Court Judges, Clerks and Magistrates Under Employ in the Eastern District of Michigan and in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit to Coerce the People and the Government of this District;” (26 pages)
- d) **“EXHIBIT B”** – “Memorandum on Rights of (We,) ‘The People’: To Assemble; to Local Governance; and to Withdraw ‘Consent’ Through State and Federal Jury Nullification, Through Grand Jury Presentments, Through Private Prosecutions, and Through Other Executions of Customary Law and the Laws of Commerce.” (165 pages)

3. Grievants/Claimants and PAG’s David Schied and Cornell Squires, and all those *“others enjoined”* together as Grievants/Claimants, categorically DENY, OBJECT, and DO NOT CONSENT to the entirety of Stephanie Davis’ “Section III: Analysis and Conclusion” based upon numerous *“frauds by omissions of specific facts”* and *“abuse of official power and authority by misapplication of the laws.”* Evidence of such frauds and abuses is provided by **“EXHIBIT A”** and **“EXHIBIT B”** attached herein and respectively captioned as follows:

- e) **“EXHIBIT A”** – “Sworn Follow-Up Affidavit and Crime Report of David Schied in Report on 8/22/16 of Additional Crimes Committed by Magistrate Stephanie Davis, Who is Working as a ‘Domestic Terrorist’ Along with Other U.S. District Court Judges, Clerks and Magistrates Under Employ in the Eastern District of Michigan and in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit to Coerce the People and the Government of this District;” (26 pages)
- f) **“EXHIBIT B”** – “Memorandum on Rights of (We,) ‘The People’: To Assemble; to Local Governance; and to Withdraw ‘Consent’ Through State and Federal Jury Nullification, Through Grand Jury Presentments, Through

Private Prosecutions, and Through Other Executions of Customary Law and the Laws of Commerce.” (165 pages)

4. Grievants/Claimants and PAG’s David Schied and Cornell Squires, and all those “*others enjoined*” together as Grievants/Claimants, categorically DENY, OBJECT, and DO NOT CONSENT to the entirety of Stephanie Davis’ “Section IV: Recommendation” based upon numerous “*frauds by omissions of specific facts*” and “*abuse of official power and authority by misapplication of the laws.*” Evidence of such frauds and abuses is provided by **“EXHIBIT A”** and **“EXHIBIT B”** attached herein and respectively captioned as follows:

g) **“EXHIBIT A”** – “Sworn Follow-Up Affidavit and Crime Report of David Schied in Report on 8/22/16 of Additional Crimes Committed by Magistrate Stephanie Davis, Who is Working as a ‘Domestic Terrorist’ Along with Other U.S. District Court Judges, Clerks and Magistrates Under Employ in the Eastern District of Michigan and in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit to Coerce the People and the Government of this District;”

Note that **“Exhibit A”** consists of 26 pages PLUS adjoining “*exhibits*” as referenced, and as being attached.

Note also that these “*exhibit*” documents to **“Exhibit A”** are labeled as **“EXHIBITS #1 through #62”**, which consist mostly of “*cover*” pages to full scale Exhibits that are being also “*served*” herein on the U.S. District Court, on Stephanie Davis/Avern Cohn, and upon each of the co-Defendants – including the four named “DOES” – by way of imbedded links and web addresses on the Internet.

As a Final Note regarding these supporting documents: These documents are being referenced as documents that have already been previously “*served*” upon this federal Court, and admittedly “*reviewed*” by Stephanie Davis prior to her issuance of “Report and Recommendation.” As such, these documents are listed by reference to what already exists in this Article III Court of Record. In the context of this instant filing they will be referred to by the combination of the alphabet letter “A” followed by the sub-category of exhibit number (such as “*Exhibit A-1*” or “*Exhibit A-34*”).

- h) **“EXHIBIT B”** – “Memorandum on Rights of (We,) ‘The People’: To Assemble; to Local Governance; and to Withdraw ‘Consent’ Through State and Federal Jury Nullification, Through Grand Jury Presentments, Through Private Prosecutions, and Through Other Executions of Customary Law and the Laws of Commerce.” (165 pages)

SPECIFIC STATEMENTS OF “OBJECTION” AND “FINAL NOTICE” OF “NO CONSENT” TO WHAT STEPHANIE DAVIS HAS DONE, IS DOING AND TO WHAT SHE PROPOSES TO DO

Grievants/Claimants and Private Attorney Generals, David Schied and Cornell Squires, incorporate by reference “Exhibit A” (including all of the referenced “Exhibits #1 through #62”) and “Exhibit B” as written herein verbatim as applicable to each section outlined below.

Generally, it is *prima facie* Evidence that Stephanie Davis has committed gross *“fraud upon the court”* by construction of her “Report of Recommendation” the completely “OMITS” at least forty-two (42) UNREBUTTED “Affidavits” that have been filed, served, and without recognition or resolve by this so-called federal *“court.”* Significantly, Davis has neither recognized nor responded to the latest of these *Affidavits*, shown as **“EXHIBIT A-41”** and **“EXHIBIT A-42”** as the “Sworn Affidavit and Crime Report...” of Cornell Squires and David Schied respectively, “In Report on 7/18/16 of Crimes Committed by U.S. District Court Judges, Clerks and Magistrates Under Employ in the Eastern District of Michigan and in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.”

Further, Stephanie Davis has OMITTED even the mention of many other documents that have been time-stamped (by cover-page) and/or with “*Certificate of Service*” upon both this Federal Court and this Article III Court of Record, and “served” upon the co-Defendants. This is despite Davis having admitted to having familiarize herself enough with the “extensive” record in this case to provide, intentionally, a fraudulent “*procedural history*.” As proof of her “*lying by omissions*,” Grievants/Claimants/PAGs David Schied and Cornell Squires herein incorporate by reference all numbered paragraphs of “**Exhibit A**” as #14 through #17, inclusive of all sub-paragraphs “a” through “z” and “aa” through “nn” as if written herein verbatim, being incorporated also herein as predicate to the address of EACH of the following FOUR sections as presented below.

Addressing Stephanie Davis’ fraudulent “Section I: Procedural History”:

The “Procedural History” presented to this Article III Court of Record by Stephanie Davis was intentionally and fraudulently tainted with gross *errors* and *omissions* of relevant and substantive FACTS, inclusive minimally of the following:

5. Aside from what has already been stated above, Davis *fraudulently* mischaracterized *sui juris* Grievant and Private Attorney General as simply a “*pro se Plaintiff*” when this is clearly misleading, even fraudulent, given that

she provided no acknowledgement whatsoever to the “joinder” filings, and despite her claim to have “*reviewed the extensive record in this matter.*” (See **“EXHIBIT #A-44”** as a copy of Stephanie Davis’ 10-page *fraudulent* filing dated 8/11/16.)

6. From even the “*header*” of the document constructed by Stephanie Davis, she used ALL CAPS OF LETTERING to mischaracterize me (David Schied) as a “*corporation,*” or otherwise “*appearing*” to the court in anything other than his capacity as a *natural and sovereign American man, a flesh-and-blood* human being. This flagrantly disregards the detailed explanation of who I am, as the “*Party*” bringing the initial “*Complaint/Claim of Damages*”; and it disregarded the content of the footnote content of EVERY SINGLE FILING in this case submitted by me, which asserted that I am a natural man.

Importantly, my status as a natural man, filing my various documents without challenge as “*Grievant/PAG David Schied,*” was reaffirmed at the onset of this case as being a “*natural,*” living, breathing, human person – and NOT a “*14th Amendment ‘citizen’*” – by the fact that this U.S. District Court had provided me with a status of being “*forma pauperis,*” which the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit has determined to connect such a status with such a natural man as myself. (See **“EXHIBIT #A-43”** as the Cover Page for the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal’s which holds the web location where the

entire document can be downloaded.) See also the section called “Parties” of the initial filing of “Complaint/Claim of Damages” in this case describing me, David Schied, as “*a private American national citizen of the United States of America, private residing and privately domiciling outside of a federal district and within a nonmilitary occupied private state not subject to the jurisdiction of the United States*” as reference in paragraph 18a or “**Exhibit A.**”

Further, my status in the history of common law is well established, as found in “**Exhibit B**” as marked by the following sections of that document’s Table of Contents: Section A, Section B, and Section C (inclusive of subsections C-1, C-2, C-2a, and C-2b).

7. Stephanie Davis grossly omitted that Grievant/PAG David Schied was “*enjoined*” at the end of March 2016 by another individual, Cornell Squires, and fourteen (14) other aggrieved parties against the co-Defendants, with David Schied adding to his “*status*” that of being a Private Attorney General, and from that point forward, filing his addresses to the Article III Court of Record with Cornell Squires with clear notice of that added status of “*Private Attorney General*”. (See “**Exhibit #A-2**” and the accompanying explanation provided for this “*exhibit*” in the “Sworn Follow-Up Affidavit and Crime Report”.)
8. With regard to “**Exhibit #A-44**” referenced above:

- a) In listing the “Counts of [David Schied’s] Complaint,” (i.e., “**Exhibit #A-44**” p.1 footnotes) Stephanie Davis conveniently ignored the content of the “*Cover Page*” for the “Complaint/Claim of Damages” that was carefully constructed and filed by Grievant/PAG David Schied. She also fraudulently changed Grievant’s “Claim[s] for Relief” to “*Counts*” (i.e., see the body of the “Complaint/Claim for Damages” by referring to the Internet link immediately above; or in the alternative, by reference to “*Docket Item #1*” in the U.S. District Court “*record*”) and using substituted words, gross omissions, and wordplay to commit substantive FRAUD in the construction of her “*official court document*,” so to accomplish her criminal objective of “*finding*” prejudicial favor for her cohorts as members of the same State BAR of Michigan to which she is also a conspiring member.
- b) As a matter of significant FACT when summarily outlining her premise in the “*Procedural History*” section, Stephanie Davis conspicuously failed to the crux of my initial filing of “Complaint/Claim for Damages”) when also downplaying as “*fact*” (p.1 of “**Exhibit #A-44**”) that I was “*request[ing] money damages along with injunctive and declaratory relief.*” As the fact that the “*money damages*” were assessed to be in a “Demand for Relief” excess of \$150,000,000.00 (one hundred fifty million dollars), so too were

the allegations were framed within the scope of the “State-Created Danger Doctrine” which was also omitted by Davis.

9. Other gross OMISSIONS affirmatively committed by Stephanie Davis – by perjury of her Oath of official judicial office (which is a violation of 28 U.S.C. § 453 as referenced in the Footnote #219 of “**Exhibit B**”) – includes that this “*judicial usurper*” Davis disregarded that the actual “Claim[s] for Relief” were listed in that original “*Complaint/Claim for Damages*” filing, which is outlined in “**Exhibit A**” paragraphs numbered 19(b)(2)(“a” through “g”) incorporated herein verbatim.
10. Throughout her fraudulent “*report and recommendation,*” the criminal perpetrator Stephanie Davis refers to “his” **conviction** as if it was established “*fact,*” and NOT the State Created Danger action that my Affidavit (i.e., see “**Exhibit #A-3**” above) shows occurred while the “*judicial usurper*” Karen Khalil had no personal or subject matter jurisdiction, and occurred while I was sitting quietly with a note pad in the public gallery of a public building in witness of public events. Davis clearly disregards that maxim, “*Ex dolo malo non oritur action*” or “*Out of fraud no action arises*” and “*Qui per fraudem agit, frustra agit*” or “*He who acts fraudulently acts in vain.*” (Bovier’s 1856 Law Dictionary) She also does so while taking the stance that scope of “*review*” of that “*conviction*” is limited to ONLY what an unrelated “*case law*” states

should be the limiting conditions for the review of THAT OTHER case – and even without providing a copy of that other case for direct reference. Further, she tortuously does so while additionally instructing me – as a *forma pauperis* litigant without an attorney – to respond back (and *completely* or be forced to relinquish whatever I don't object to) within 14 days. (See the final page of **“Exhibit #A-44”**)

Addressing Stephanie Davis' fraudulent “Section II: Plaintiff's Complaint”:

11. With regard to “*usurper*” Davis’ **section “II”** misrepresenting other so-called “*facts*” of “***Plaintiff's Complaint***” (see pp. 2-3 of **“Exhibit #A-44”**): she (Davis) recklessly OMITTED other important items as she brushed over the itemization of the actual “*demands*” that Grievant/PAG David Schied had otherwise meticulously spelled out in that very first federal court filing of this case. As examples, this judicial *usurper*, Davis, failed to acknowledge the following as **required “DECLARATORY” ADMISSIONS based upon already *presented* actual FACTS as they are also found in the IRREFUTABLE and UNREBUTTED testimonial AFFIDAVITS OF EYEWITNESSES, which are referenced in the accompanying **“Exhibit A”** paragraphs 19(b)(3)(“a” through “m”) incorporated herein verbatim.**

12. Moreover, in providing what she clearly *misrepresents* as an adequate summary of “*the extensive record in this matter,*” this “*derelict public functionary*” –

Stephanie Davis – GROSSLY OMITTED the FACT that Grievants/PAGs David Schied and Cornell Squires, acting in the public’s interest and in behalf of the fourteen (14) “joinder” Grievants/Claimants is this very same case, had filed both an “objection” to Davis’ initial involvement in this case, as well filing very pronounced “Writ of Error” to her “Order” that Grievant/Claimant David Schied should provide a written response to the filing of a “motion” by one of my named “DOES” on behalf of the so-called “Redford Defendants” that was never served upon him. Even more importantly is that FACT that Davis disregarded that the pronouncement of those above–referenced objections were in the form of “Sworn and Notarized Affidavit[s] and Crime Report[s]” naming Stephanie Davis herself as a criminal co-conspirator in this matter. See references to “**Exhibit A-45**” and “**Exhibit A-46**” as incorporated herein by reference.

13. Davis intentionally disregarded Claimants/PAGs David Schied’s and Cornell Squires’) “responses” to her “order” as inclusive of criminal allegations that were shown to the federal Court DELIVERED TO THE U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL LORETTA LYNCH in Washington, D.C. – or rather by more specificity, that Davis decided to leave those criminal allegations UNREBUTTED while using her “assigned administrative position” in seeking a new path of tortuous deception and treasonous action of

“obstructing justice” by writing a “*sua sponte*” fraudulent “Report and Recommendation” for a summary dismissal of the case by a 91-year old so-called “*federal judge*” who has done nothing on this case and is otherwise riding out his “*lifetime employment*” on this Article III federal case while ignoring my “Order to Show Cause...” [reason why this judge has taken no action on this case for over 15 months while all of these unresolved nine (9) motions PLUS the matter of other “*stricken*” documents that were “*replaced*” while pending a decision regarding the lawfulness of the previous “*magistrate*” (Hluchaniuk)], and while ignoring Grievants’/PAGs’ “Order for Competency Hearing...” on this “*judge*” Avern Cohn when he failed to “*Show Cause*” – **demonstrates itself, *prima facie*, the propensity of Stephanie Davis to “lie by omissions” when publishing her “Report” of the actual “history” of this case (under Oath to the Constitution), and to present her “sua sponte recommendation” for dismissal of the entire case, including all “joinder” cases, without even mention of them, and while ridiculously also recommending that nine (9) separate “pending motions” be “dismissed as moot.”**

14. Even the idea of all this is ludicrous. **It reeks on the surface of *due process violations* all over the place as proven by the Evidence (referenced herein as “Exhibits A-47 through A-57”) and links referenced in the accompanying**

“Exhibit A” – which is incorporated herein by reference – by way of the following listed paragraphs and the Evidence each of these paragraphs reference: Paragraphs 21(a); 21(b); 21(c); 21(d)(“1” through “4”); 21(e); 21(f)(“#1 through #5”); and 21(g);

15. Specific *misrepresentations* included in the first two sections of Davis’ *fraudulent “Report and Recommendation”* include the following (thus far) UNREBUTTED AND INDISPUTABLE FACTS which are all supported by the *Affidavits* (as referenced above) and, even if challenged are “*merited*” claims upon which relief CAN be granted, and for which ONLY A JURY CAN DECIDE AT TRIAL, *not* by any judge determining single-handedly, with or without “*recommendation,*” in summary fashion.
16. The gross *omissions* of just the above FACTS after claiming – under oath – that she had “*reviewed the extensive record,*” while restating and summarizing the “*highlights*” of the actual case filed by me, David Schied, in May, 2015, and while misrepresenting these misleading statements as actually being the “*Procedural History*” of my actual “*Complaint/Claim of Damages,*” constitutes a felony “*obstruction of justice,*” “*misprision of felony,*” “*misprision of treason,*” “*deprivation of rights under color of law,*” and a “*conspiracy to deprive of rights,*” minimally, in just the first two pages of her **fraudulent** “*report*” and “*official*” court record.

17. As an important SUBSTANTIVE omission to her fraudulent “*report and recommendation,*” the *treasonous domestic terrorist*, Stephanie Davis, completely disregarded the actions I took, as Grievant and as Private Attorney General, in the aftermath of the first “*magistrate*” Michael Hluchaniuk “*striking*” the four designated sets of SUBSTANTIVE Statements and Evidence, giving cause for me to file an “Objection” to Hluchaniuk’s wrongful action, followed by a “Writ of Mandamus for Interlocutory Appeal” that was filed along with a “Memorandum at Law” which, after being filed with the U.S. District Court and in the Article III Court of Record on the Internet, was conveyed to me as having been transferred over to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals where it was subsequently all sent back down (and STILL PENDING) by claim by the Sixth Circuit “*judges*” that the “*order striking*” all those SUBSTANTIVE documents was not a “*final*” order. Thus, with the clear intent to deprive me of due process, and under claim to have familiarized herself with the entire case file, Davis has CRIMINALLY refused to acknowledge that the matter of the SUBSTANTIVE contents of the four (4) sets of “*STRICKEN*” filings and the “Memorandum at Law” accompanying that “Writ for Interlocutory Appeal”, as well as the SUBSTANTIVE content of the four (4) sets of “*REPLACEMENT*” filings, still need to be judicially addressed IN COMMON LAW TERMS, and in accordance with the laws and procedures

outlined in the “Memorandum at Law.” Again, this reeks all over the place – *prima facie* – of criminal intent on deprivation of rights under color of law, as proven by the Evidence and the links referenced in “Exhibit A” as included herein by reference to paragraphs 25(a); 25(b) and 25(c) inclusive of the related “Exhibits #A-58, #A-59, and #A-60”.

Addressing Stephanie Davis’ fraudulent “Section III: Analysis and Conclusion, Subsection A – ‘Standard of Review’”:

18. As a matter of yet another significant FACT, in treasonous fashion and in acting in “*pattern and practice*” of her cohorts in domestic terrorism through the illegitimate coercion of legitimate government policies and practices, Stephanie Davis constructed a fraudulent “*Standard of Review*” between page 3 through 8 of her 10-page document, basing her “*Recommendation*” on pages 9 through 10 upon UNRELATED case law. In doing so, she conveyed in abbreviated fashion that Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, “Rule 8(a)(2)” should take precedence over and above the SUBSTANTIVE research amply provided by Grievant/PAG David Schied’s previously–filed “Memorandum at Law” supporting the “Writ of Mandamus for Interlocutory Appeal” referenced above.

19. Davis also did so while incredibly insinuating that other UNRELATED CASES (of “*Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*” and “*League of United Latin Am. Citizens v. Bredesen*”) somehow provide a *nexus* for applicability to her “Report and

Recommendation” about dismissing my case in its entirety (and dismissing 9 pending motions and 4 “*replacement*” sets of “*stricken*” filings) because these UNRELATED cases address the issue of “*providing grounds of entitlement to relief,*” and “*requires more than labels and conclusions,*” and provide “*factual allegations...enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level.*”

20. Clearly, any rational person would find this type of reason to reflect *insanity* of such type of thinking, given the context of Davis’ claim to have “*reviewed*” all of the above to the extent of writing a 10-page exercise of nonsense. However, **given that context, it underscores the FACT that Stephanie Davis’ actions were a willful, intentional, and treasonous effort to “aid and abet” in the CRIMES being reported by the “*stricken*” and subsequently “*replaced*” documents, and to disregard the superseding State legislation that tells “*any*” judge how such criminal allegations should be prosecuted according to the law, regardless of who are the ones being pointed out as “*the Accused.*” This was the entire basis for the “Memorandum at Law” referenced above.**

21. The actual “*Standard of Review*” then SHOULD HAVE BEEN – and actually is – the recognized standard that state legislation has over federal rules; and that “*substantial*” claims have over “*procedure,*” as clearly laid out by the “Memorandum of Law’s” reference to the Enabling Act of 1934, codified as 28 U.S.C. § 2072, which clearly states:

“[T]he Supreme Court of the United States shall have the power to prescribe by general rules . . . the forms of process, writs, pleadings, and motions, and

the practice and procedure in civil actions at law. Said rules shall neither abridge, enlarge, nor modify the substantive rights of any litigant.”

22. In fact, as pointed out by that **“Memorandum of Law”** (i.e., see again **“Exhibit #A-60”**) what any judge having the power to do – or to even **“recommend”** doing in accordance with the clear legislation of the State of Michigan – is to process (especially unrebutted) sworn criminal complaints (in the form of Affidavits) as criminal **“indictments;”** and to issue IMMEDIATE arrest warrants against the criminally **“accused”** so to begin an immediate formal **“inquiry”** and **“prosecution”** of the UNREBUTTED sworn testimony (i.e., by the required **“point-by-point”** testimonial of a controverting sworn affidavit in challenge of the first) and of the IRREFUTABLE evidence.

Addressing Stephanie Davis’ fraudulent ““Section III: Analysis and Conclusion, Subsection B – ‘Heck v. Humphrey’”:

23. As a matter of important FACT relative to this federal case – the case about which Stephanie Davis’ **“Report and Recommendation”** so fraudulently circumvents and undermines to as to provide **“safe harboring”** via FELONY violation of both her of her cohorts of **18 U.S.C. § 4** among other federal criminal codes as provided by the Evidence of **“domestic terrorism”** herein in this Affidavit and preceding Affidavits I and others have completed and made public – **NEITHER THE CASE LAWS NOR THE PREMISES UPON**

WHICH THOSE UNRELATED CASES WERE INTRODUCED TO MY FEDERAL CASE BY DAVIS PROVIDE ANY NEXUS OF CONNECTION TO WHAT IS OUTLINED ABOVE AS THE PREEMINANT AND DOMINATING FACTS AND THE LAWS APPLICABLE TO THIS CASE. As such, Grievants/Claimants/PAGs David Schied and Cornell Squires categorically DENY, OBJECT, and REJECT ALL of the cases listed and/or referenced by Davis, and their underlying premises, as they were presented by Stephanie Davis with fraudulent and other criminal intent.

Rather than list those cases again herein as referenced by **“Exhibit A,”** Grievants/Claimants/PAGs David Schied and Cornell Squires incorporate – verbatim – the paragraphs marked in that accompanying **“Exhibit A”** as Paragraphs 27(a); 27(a); 27(a); 27(a); 27(a); 27(a); 27(a); and 27(a), inclusive of all referenced **“Exhibits” (#A-6; #A-49; and #A-61).**

Addressing Stephanie Davis’ fraudulent “Section IV: Recommendation”:

24. The above pages of significantly important and highly relevant FACTS, as supported entirely by Evidence ALREADY in the Article III Court of Record for this instant case, proves – *prima facie* – the high level of *fraudulence* perpetrated upon, and treasonously against, the United States District Court, by a “trustee” of *law and order*, a Trustee of the American Constitution as the all-

important *Public Trust* created by and for the American people as the very foundation of our national governance. As such, the above “*objections*” as articulated in various ways to include those EXPOSING Davis’ motivational premise and proving criminal *Corruption* and *Racketeering*, *Misprision of Treason*, and other CRIMES carrying penalties for violation that include the penalties of long periods of penal confinement and even death, Grievants/Claimants/PAGs David Schied and Cornell Squires have met that “*heightened standard*” for proving FRAUD, and a CONSPIRACY TO FRAUD between Davis and her cohorts, as the other attorneys, magistrates, judges, and even clerks who have been associated with this instant “*Complaint/Claim for Damages*.” Therefore, the “*Recommendation*” presented by Stephanie Davis is rejected, denied, objected to, and denied consent, in its entirety, line-by-line, sentence-by-sentence, paragraph-by-paragraph, and section-by-section.

CONTROLLING OR MOST APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY FOR RELIEF

The previous-filed 50-page “*Memorandum of Law*”⁷ that was completely and conspicuously ignored by all of the co-Defendants and their attorneys. It is therefore – by DEFAULT – the most *appropriate* authority pertaining to this entire

⁷ What follows is cited directly from the *Table of Contents* of this memorandum, which can be found in the Article III Court of Record publicly posted online at:

http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/033116_PAGsSchied&Squires_Joinderof-14-ClaimantsCrimeVictims/CoverFiling&MemorandumofLaw/MemorandumofLaw/MemorandumofLawonBLACclaimsonJoinderClaimants_ALL.pdf

matter because it addresses the following unaddressed matters of fact, and

unrefuted matters of law:

- 1) *This case involves Constitutional Tort claims characterized as “backward-looking right-of-access (to court)” cases filed in “joinder” and in claim of Fundamental Rights under the First Amendment’s “Petition Clause.”*
- 2) *This case involves basic notions of duty, breach, causation and damages of Common Law Torts that apply to Constitutional actions such as been prosecuted by Grievants/Private Attorney Generals (PAGs) David Schied and Cornell Squires. Therefore, those acting in the capacity of government officials need to be punished – civilly and criminally – in order to deter the furthering of unconstitutional behaviors that have, in this case, escalated into “Domestic Terrorism” by definition.*
- 3) *This case involves Allegations and Evidence of a “pattern and practice” of felony misconduct, government usurpation, racketeering, treason, and domestic terrorism, which preclude dismissal of this case for lack of statutory provisions for punishment.*
- 4) *This case also involves Allegations and Evidence of a “pattern and practice” of unconstitutional discrimination and a regulation against state citizens with claims in commerce against the surety of state employees and the performance guarantees of the Oaths of Office of those public functionaries. As such, interfering with the claims against quasi-government contracts of interstate commerce, claims against public official liabilities, and claims against statutorily ordered securities and guarantees by constitutional Oaths, are constitutional violations in and of themselves, as well as matters of ‘important’ public interest, and giving cause for the Private Attorney General(s) to intervene in this case in the public interest and as a matter of ‘Important Right’.*

THE REASONS STATED ABOVE PRECLUDE STEPHANIE DAVIS HAVING ANY “OFFICIAL” AUTHORITY TO ACT IN THIS CASE, OR OF HAVING ANY “PERSONAL” AUTHORITY TO ISSUE ANY TYPE OF ‘ORDER’ TO GRIEVANT WITHOUT COMMITTING A TORTUOUS CRIMINAL OFFENSE REQUIRING REMEDIATION AND REMEDY, WITHOUT “IMMUNITY”

Thus far, there have been TWO un rebutted, officially notarized “Sworn Affidavit and Crime Reports” presented herein as *prima facie* to support the above

Statements ascertaining that Stephanie Davis has committed crimes against Grievants/PAGs David Schied and Cornell Squires, and others related to this instant set of “joinder” cases. These two Exhibits of Evidence stand as unrebutted, and as *prima facie* “reasonable cause to believe that crimes have been committed” by Stephanie Davis. **These Allegations, as supported by the Evidence, constitute SUBSTANTIVE causes for prescriptive action to be taken according to State laws if the Article III judiciary finds no Congressional legislation that direct its Constitutional course for pursuing these criminal allegations.**

*“Grievant David Schied’s ‘Memorandum of Law’ in Support of Grievant’s ‘Writ of Mandamus for Interlocutory Appeal’ With Questions of Law Pertaining to Whether Judicial ‘Legislation’ is Constitutional; Whether Judicial Independence Authorizes ‘Bad’ Behavior; and Whether ‘Substantive’ Evidence Can Be ‘Procedurally’ Stricken; and Whether Evidence of a ‘Pattern and Practice’ of Government Coercion Constitutes Treason and/or ‘Domestic Terrorism’”*⁸

(Bold emphasis)

he “Sworn Affidavit and Crime Report” presented in **“Exhibit A”** was mailed to the United States Attorney General Loretta Lynch on 7/18/16. Proof of

⁸ For the procedure set forth by the State of Michigan for “ANY” judge “of record” to deal with criminal allegations and a sworn criminal complaint, see the “Memorandum of Law” that had previously accompanied the “Writ for Interlocutory Appeal...” already filed in this Article III Court of Record near the end of 2015 as found online at the following link:
http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEdM/111815_WritMandamusInterlocAppeal&MemorandumLaw/EntireMemorandumofLaw.pdf

mailing was provided as a copy of the Receipt for that mailing to the zip code of the Department of Justice in Washington, DC.

In addition, upon information and belief, Stephanie Davis is an alien subversive being employed, like her predecessor Michael Hluchaniuk, by the Eastern District of Michigan to carry out and/or to sustain domestic terrorist acts that rival Nazi Germany. These acts, committed in oversight fashion with a rational choice to stand by and watch as others commit acts that “*Shock the Conscience*” of reasonable people, or to take measure to stop such acts of torment, humiliation, and assaults on human dignity and rights. The United States judiciary has no jurisdiction to “*place*” or “*plant*” their “*agents of tort and national destruction*” within these positions of power in the Eastern District of Michigan. Evidence of these assertions are found in previously submitted Exhibits which consists of the following documents:

- 1) An explanatory “*Press Release*” issued by “*The Criminally Accused,*” David Weaver, giving public notice that his accomplice in “*aiding and abetting*” or “*accessory after the fact,*” being Stephanie Davis, was “*appointed*” to fill the position of “*magistrate*” that was vacated by Michael Hluchaniuk, who left his job right after “*striking*” four sets of substantive documents and right after Grievant David Schied filed his “*objection*” to that action and subsequently filed the aforementioned “*Writ for Interlocutory Appeal*” and

“Memorandum of Law” detailing how Hluchaniuk acted in dereliction of his duty to pursue the alleged crimes depicted in those “*stricken*” documents, rather than to attempt to cover up those crimes by striking the Allegations and Evidence from the federal court record.

- 2) The “*cover page*” for LegalNews.com dated 10/14/15 announcing that Michael Hluchaniuk was retiring, the very same month that Grievant David Schied filed a formal “*Objection*” to Hluchaniuk having, within 30 days of issuing his “Order” and “Amended Order” (i.e., on 9/30/15) attempting to “*strike*” the substantive Evidence of crimes committed by numerous of his fellow State BAR of Michigan members under employ as *judicial usurpers* in various State courts, at the Office of the U.S. Attorney Barbara McQuade, at the Office of the Michigan Attorney General, and at the federal court at the Eastern District of Michigan.²
- 3) An Article demonstrating that the “*position*” previously inhabited by Hluchaniuk and now inhabited by Davis is a known position of

⁹ Note that the proverbial “*Revolving Door*” between the judicial and executive branches precludes there being anything wrong in stating implying that there are “*judge*” working for the Michigan Attorney General and the Office of the U.S. Attorney in Detroit. For the most immediate Evidence that is available, see as PAG Cornell Squires sworn and notarized Affidavit describing his experiences with the “*retired prosecutor*” of 80+year (old) that was being used as a matter of “*pattern and practice*” by the criminal operating the “*Wayne County Circuit Court*” as a “*substitute judge*” to come in and routinely dismiss cases for other judges, so as to deny litigants like Mr. Squires his proper “*access-to-the-court*” and a paid-for “*Trial by Jury.*”

unconstitutional authority known by “*the Court*” and by the *Public at Large* for delivering unconstitutional “*Article I Administrative Orders*” that clearly support the co-Defendants’ *domestic terrorism* agenda by “*coercing certain populations*” of Southeastern Michigan (i.e., kidnapped, falsely imprisoned, and/or other incarcerated WOMEN) into being humiliatingly “*strip-searched...in groups of 30 to 50 at a time...in the presence of male officers...[under employ of the] Wayne County Sheriff’s Department.*” See also the previously-submitted entry showing that it was Hluchaniuk that issued that “*order*” on 6/2/15 allowing for these strip search privacy violations to continue in a fashion rivaling the Auschwitz Concentration Camp of World War II Germany, for which numerous guards of that camp were later prosecuted for War Crimes for these types of Human Rights violations.

Notably, the Evidence available in both Common Law, Criminal Law, Federal Codes, Judge-Made Law, the Law of Nations, Natural Law, Laws of Custom, and the Laws of Commerce altogether preclude there being any “*immunity*” whatsoever for *anyone* accused of personally committing crimes and/or Constitutional torts of the “*style*” depicted above. Importantly, some of these above-reference laws allows remedies to be found outside of judge-made law. This particularly stands true regarding the denial of the Fundamental Right to

access the Court – by those operating the Court itself – through other forms of *remedy* against these types of First Amendment violations of Grievants’ persisting fundamental right to “*redress of grievances.*”

ORDER OF DEFAULT JUDGMENT
BASED UPON UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVITS CONSTITUTING A
“WAIVER” OF FURTHER ACTION OR APPEAL

As demonstrated in this Article III Court of Record, there has been numerous entries into the Record naming James Mellon, Jeffrey Clark, Warren White, and Charles Browning as “DOES” in this case; by their criminal conduct (all named), their fraud-upon-the-court (all named), by their failure to file an “*appearance*” (Browning) while still being “*represented*” in the case, and by the demonstrated “*conflict-of-interest*” (Clark) in representing both the employer and the individuals named in the “*private*” or “*natural*” capacities.

The “*respondents*” to these allegations, like the “*pattern and practice*” of silence found with Stephanie Davis in light of the criminal allegations against her, have all remained UNREBUTTED and without any sworn testimonials refuting these allegations. As such, the civil and criminal Allegations continue to stand, and in the interest in “*justice,*” in the light that the 92-year old “presiding judge” in this instant case, Avern Cohn, has refused to respond to the previous TWO “Writs for Show Cause” and the subsequent “Order for Competency Hearing,” JUDGMENT and ORDER OF THE FOLLOWING IS ESTABLISHED HEREIN:

- 1) All criminal allegations, submitted by Affidavits as shown by the sixty-two “*exhibits*” from “*Exhibit A-1*” through “*Exhibit A-62*,” inclusive of at least forty-two UNREBUTTED Affidavits, now stand as undisputed, and indisputable, TRUTH and FACT.
- 2) Damages as a result of the said civil and criminal violations alleged and unrebutted, are hereby assessed as \$10,000 per person, per allegation, inclusive of those allegations of FRAUD stemming back to 2003 through 2010 as provided in “*Exhibit A-24*” submitted by Sworn Affidavit and dated 2/10/10.
- 3) Payment on these amount by “the Accused” individuals, as natural persons accused in their natural capacities as flesh-and-blood men and women, is due immediately.
- 4) Any further delay upon the payments now due, will give just cause and good reason for implementing NON-JUDICIAL REMEDIES as outlined fully in “**EXHIBIT B**” captioned as follows within ninety (90) days from today’s date (8/25/16):

“Memorandum on Rights of (We), ‘The People’; To Assemble; To Local Governance; and to Withdraw ‘Consent’ Through State and Federal Jury Nullification, Through Grand Jury Presentments, Through Private Prosecutions, and Through Other Executions of Customary Law and the Laws of Commerce.”

CONCLUSION IN ‘DENIAL’ AND ‘ORDER’ OF RELIEF

FURTHER, IT IS ORDERED that, in response to the proposed “Notice and Order for Substitution of Attorneys,” this proposed “order” is **DENIED**.

The basis of this “denial” is because Plunkett-Cooney, without a signed cover letter of accountability, proposes to “*substitute*” Charles Browning for Warren White, when such substitution is **IMPOSSIBLE**. As shown by all filings, on both sides, Charles “*no appearance*” Browning has been a **FRAUDULENT** part of this case since inception, with his name applied to the filings of both sides. Additionally, neither White nor Browning are eligible any longer to “represent” the “ICSOP” and “AIG” co-Defendants because both of these criminal obstructionists are named by this case as “*DOES*” along with James Mellon and Jeffrey Clark.

FURTHER, IT IS ORDERED that any future action carried out to obstruct justice or to hinder Grievants/Claimants/PAGs (and their “*joinder*” participants in this action) all being reported **CRIME VICTIMS**, will be construed as felony obstruction and interference with the testimony of federally-reported crime victims and/or their witnesses. Such interference will **NOT** be tolerated further and will result in further action as lawfully warranted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Stephanie Davis' DEBT has been increased to take into proper account for the ADDITIONAL damages tortuously induced upon, minimally, David Schied since the last notice on 7/19/16. The related cost calculations have been re-evaluated to include the \$10,000 per-person-per-occurrence. As a courtesy, David Schied reasserts that this DEBT must be paid immediately as real costs incurred against David Schied, Cornell Squires, and all of the other named "*joinder*" Grievants. It is ORDERED to be paid IMMEDIATELY, conditioned only upon Stephanie Davis privately responding within 90 days – in detail and with supporting Sworn Affidavit and a "point-by-point" reference to contravening Evidence – to rebuke and prove error each and every one of the Criminal Allegations pertaining to her as detailed in the previous filing(s) and in this instant filing of "Sworn Follow-Up Affidavit and Crime Report" backed by 62 "*exhibits*" of indisputable Evidence.

Respectively,

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

(all rights reserved)

Dated: 8/2516