David Schied P.O. Box 1378 Novi, Michigan 48376 Notice to Principal is Notice to Agent; and Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal

THIS REPORT IS BEING MADE IN FOLLOW-UP
TO PREVIOUS NOTICES ABOUT FRAUD AND
CORRUPTION BEING PERPETRATED BY THE PEOPLE
OPERATING THE CORPORATE "STATE OF MICHIGAN"

11/20/16

To: Executive Director Christopher Seppanen and other Administrative Law Judges Michigan Dept. of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs as Agent acting "on behalf" of the "counter-party" of the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services ("DHS")

Re: Ongoing issues related to two hearings scheduled for Wednesday, November 24, 2016

Executive Director Christopher Seppanen and to Whomever Else It May Concern:

I begin this "statement for the record" by proclaiming that as of today I have NOT been provided any indication that I will be receiving any proof whatsoever that any of your "administrative law judges" or other employees of either the LARA or the DHS have either an Oath to the Michigan and United States constitutions or any bonded guarantees to "We, The People" of Michigan or the United States for "faithful performance" to that Oath or accompanying job duties. As such, until I receive such evidence of constitutional governance and guarantee IN COMMERCE of such, I will NOT be subscribing to any "swearing in" of any "hearing testimony"; but will instead rely upon what is being furnished to me by you and by me to you in writing.

So far, what evidence I have indicates "fraudulent pretenses," far less than "impartial treatment" to be more construed as "prejudicial treatment" taking the form of "inconsistencies" in policy application, outright lying (both to yourselves and to me) both in writing and orally "under oath", by stonewalling (on denying me documents requested under FOIA), and by extortion (i.e., by charging me several thousands of dollars to provide me with the properly documented context by which your "department(s)" is/are taking actions against me.

Let's just consider a few examples of what I have found:

On one hand, "S" (Sylvester) Williams has stated "We (being DHS agents) are covered under the state's performance bond"; while on the other hand, the DHS agents answering FOIA requests deny that any such bonds or insurance exists anywhere to their knowledge.

On one hand, I am being repeatedly told that the income of my ex-wife – who resides in her own area dwelling and who maintains her own monetary and business dealings – is to be included in the evaluation of what "benefits" are to be afforded to me by my association with the "State of Michigan." On the other hand, I am told that there is somehow a dual system (which was not fully explained to me with "contracting" with the state via the completion of an "application") of application leading to the same "case number" – one (Medicaid) in which my ex-wife's income is not supposed to be considered, and the other (Bridge Card) in which her income fully applies against me. This is despite my repeated notice to DHS that a "government" judge has endorsed "contract" law which proclaims that there has been a formal "divorce" of her finances from mine, and her "marriage" relationship to me.

All this somehow centers – according to DHS officials – upon how the DHS chooses to define "household," yet when I have submitted FOIA requests for such definitions as found within the context of your so-called "policies" and/or governing "laws," I am either stonewalled or extorted for over \$4500 in getting written documentation of such types of contextual definitions.

In fact, while my FOIA "appeals" about the above are being referred to and responded to by your "Senior Deputy Director of MIMHHS Legal" Kurt Krause – a member of the State BAR of Michigan that I have long been claiming, with supporting documents as my "proof of claim," include a membership of "domestic terrorists" operating throughout Michigan as a part of an expansive racketeering crime syndicate – DHS has responded to one of my more recent FOIA requests by inclusion of about three inches (3") of documents related to the operations of the Salvation Army, which is something that I never directly requested to receive and seemingly have nothing to do with the context of that FOIA request for documents that reflect in any way how and why Administrative Law Judges can claim to be acting "on behalf" of Nick Lyon as the Director of the DHS. In fact, when the documents supplied back in "grant" of that aspect of the FOIA request are placed under scrutiny, there is no reference whatsoever to "administrative law judges" (or "ALJ" as referred to by DHS employees with familiarity) in those "response" documents....which appears to be yet another ploy of the DHS to engage in "fraud by omissions".

As another matter of fact, it appears that what the documents do show about the relationship of the DHS and LARA makes it contractually incumbent upon others of the racketeering enterprise to ensure that families or "low-income households" like mine are provided with referral opportunities to have help in "meet[ing] home energy costs for their primary residence through payment or partial payment of bills for" the acquisition of propane gas and electricity, when that has never occurred and by all indications that information was withheld from me by those "case managers" and/or "specialists" who were most familiar with our suffering "poverty" circumstances these past few years. Again, this is yet another example of "inconsistencies" between what the "law" provides, what the "contract" and/or "policies" provide, and what is actually provided by your fiduciaries being apparently paid by BOTH the Michigan taxpayers and the United States taxpayers. This then is material suitable for application and remedy under the "False Claims Act."

Meanwhile, I am told that if I – or my ex-wife – decline or somehow "fail to provide" the DHS with documents about our work and banking relationships, or "allow" its agents to pry into our relationships with those to which we engage for "an honest day's pay for an honest day's work", then – according to the "company policy" – the DHS can also cancel benefits. Yet, as shown by what DHS agents have both orally stated (in being compelled to "help" those who are either unable or unwilling to respond to solicitations about "employment verification") and provided in responsive FOIA documentation, DHS is NOT to obtain such documentation directly from the "clients/customers" directly, but instead are mandated to obtain all "income" documentation directly from "third parties."

Consistently, neither my ex-wife nor I (and I suspect all others going to the DHS for help) somehow get no accountability from the DHS "company" in terms of their failure to provide information as otherwise required under state laws presenting certain consequences to the "government" when documents are unreasonably denied in context of what is being requested in the name of "government transparency." This would include how exactly certain written ("BAM") and other policies are being applied and how there is NOT a "conflict of interest" when the "administrative law judges" overseeing hearings are found refusing to provided (and

eventually admit to not having at all) fiduciary Oaths or performance bond guarantees while both DHS and LARA agents are admitting openly that the administrative law judges are acting "on behalf" of the "clients" and/or "customers" legal and situational opposition as the "counterparty".

When it comes to evaluating my "income" – which I refer to as a payment of "wages" which, by definition, is far different from the DHS's definition which is shared with the federal IRS, a private trust corporation viewed by many as headquartered in Puerto Rico – I am told by DHS agents (in writing) that what is being used against me is that the estimated amount of my annual "income" somehow falls <u>outside</u> of the qualifying scope of DHS "annual income limits," even though in person DHS agents agree that what they see clearly falls <u>inside</u> those very same limits. The result here is that even though DHS readily admits to having the mandate, the disposition, and the wherewithal to obtain the information it needs "from third parties," it is nevertheless claiming the <u>right</u> to terminate the so-called "benefits" of dealing with the (corporatized) State of Michigan when, in fact, no such right exists, according to the documents provided by DHS in (partial) answer to my FOIA requests.

As another example, though I am told orally that it is against DHS "policy" to cancel EITHER the medical or the food "benefits" while these "appeal hearings" are pending; yet I have proof that BOTH have been cancelled and that all benefits have again been stopped, barring me from "benefiting" from anything DHS is otherwise falsely proclaiming through fraudulent documentation to be providing to me (i.e., documents that grossly "omit" accounting for the times when such benefits have indeed been "denied" from me).

As such, with all of the above taken into account, I have nothing more to say on this matter – in hearing – until the above matters are properly addressed and resolved by the DHS and by the LARA. All further "denials" WILL be addressed by further written "appeal" with accompanying "claims in commerce" for any and all further damages to me and/or my family as a compound result of the so-called STATE OF MICHIGAN and the STATE BAR OF MICHIGAN committing numerous previous crimes again me, and while refusing to provide me with EITHER appropriate "redress" action (administrative or judicial) OR access to the (multi-county) state or federal Grand Jury (that I have demanded for years) for reporting these crimes of "public corruption," "racketeering," and "domestic terrorism" that have placed me and my family into forced despotism and dependency upon "government" in the first place, as well-documented these past 13 years.

Respectively,

Chafwithout prejulie