

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

David Schied and Cornell Squires,
Grievants/Claimants/ Crime Victims
v. *Private Attorney Generals*
Karen Khalil, et al Karen Khalil, et al
Defendants /

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

PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERALS (“PAGs”) SCHIED’S AND SQUIRES’
“WRIT OF ERROR CORAM NOBIS” AGAINST THE FRAUDULENT 6-PAGE
ADMINISTRATIVE “MEMORANDUM AND ORDER OVERRULING
[GRIEVANTS’/PAG’S] OBJECTIONS AND ADOPTING [FRAUDULENT] REPORT
AND RECOMMENDATION,’ DENYING [8] PENDING MOTIONS AS ‘MOOT’ AND
DISMISSING THE CASE, ENJOINING [GRIEVANT/PAG DAVID SCHIED] FROM
FURTHER FILNGS WITHOUT LEAVE OF THE [IMPOSTER] ‘COURT’” AND
GRANTING “DEFENDANTS’ MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY DISMISSAL”

and

ORDER OF “CONTEMPT OF [THIS [ARTICLE III)] COURT [OF RECORD]”
ISSUED AGAINST AVERN COHN AND OTHERS ‘CRIMINALLY ACCUSED’
BASED ON ELEVEN (11) AUTHENTICATED CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS
AND SWORN, NOTARIZED AFFIDAVITS PROVING PATTERNS OF FRAUD,
CORRUPTION, RACKETEERING, AND COVER-UP OF THE
“DOMESTIC TERRORISM” BEING COMMITTED BY DEFENDANTS AND
THEIR CORPORATE “AGENTS”

and

ORDER REAFFIRMING PREVIOUSLY ISSUED “ORDER OF DEFAULT
JUDGMENT” [WITH ACCOMPANING “LEDGER” IN COMMERCE]

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

The Basis of This “*Writ of Error Coram Nobis*,” “*Order of Contempt*,” and “*Ledger of Damages*” are Based in the the Evidence of a Long History of “*Aiding and Abetting*” in Criminal Acts by State Bar of Michigan Members Engaging Michigan and United States “*Courts*” in “*Domestic Terrorism*”.....1

The Tactic Used to “Dismiss” the 16-Month Old Case, Being Supposedly Done by Avern Cohn, Exemplifies the Criminal Intent of the “*Clerk(s) of the Courts*,” the (Two) “*Magistrate(s)*,” and the So-Called “*Judge*,” to Commit “*Treason*” – an Allegation That is Far From Being “*Frivolous*”8

Controlling or Most Appropriate Authority for Relief.....25

Ledger of “*Counts*” in Commerce Depicting Debts Now Owed to David Schied, and to Each of the “*Joinder*” Grievants/Claimants /Crime Victims by Each of the Above-Named People and Additionally Owed by the “*District Court*” and the “*UNITED STATES*”.....27

Argument Justifying This “*Writ of Error Coram Nobis*,” “*Order of Contempt*,” and “*Ledger of Damages*”62

Conclusion in “*Denial*” and “*Order of Relief*”66

THE BASIS OF THIS “WRIT OF ERROR CORAM NOBIS,” “ORDER OF CONTEMPT,” AND “LEDGER OF DAMAGES” ARE BASED IN THE EVIDENCE OF A LONG HISTORY OF “AIDING AND ABETTING” IN CRIMINAL ACTS BY STATE BAR OF MICHIGAN MEMBERS ENGAGING MICHIGAN AND UNITED STATES “COURTS” IN “DOMESTIC TERRORISM”

The current case was initially brought 16 months ago in “*Claim of Damages*” and in official “*Complaint*” of Common Law Tort, Kidnapping, and False Imprisonment by Defendants, acting unconstitutionally in their private and individual capacities *under color of law* and/or in such matter that “*shocks the conscience*” of any rational person, and that constitutes a “*State Created Danger*,” which altogether comprises the elements of the initial allegation that the co-Defendants are “*Domestic Terrorists*” and with Grievant David Schied having placed his formal claim upon their \$100 BILLION “*terrorism insurance*” policy (i.e., the rider to their “*excess ‘errors and omissions’ insurance*” policy covering terrorism, including “*domestic terrorism*”).

The allegations, supported by Evidence of FACTS and irrefutable sworn and notarized “*Affidavits*” of witnesses, contend that NONE of the named co-Defendants had any jurisdiction whatsoever for the commission of the alleged “*acts of terrorism*” and that, as a result, no amount of “*immunity*” is to be afforded, and for which proper “*remedy*” and penal action is warranted as a matter of state, federal, and international laws, not to mention also warranted by Customary Laws,

Common Laws, Human Rights Laws, the Law(s) of Nations, and the Laws of Commerce.

Since the onset of this instant case sixteen months ago, FACTS, EVIDENCE and UNREBUTTED SWORN STATEMENTS submitted by NOTARIZED AFFIDAVITS have been entered into this instant “*Article III, Court of Record*” calling attention to the corrupt “*pattern and practice*” being used by the District Court Clerk of the Court David Weaver, the (now “*retired*”) Magistrate Michael Hluchaniuk, the (“*replacement*”) Magistrate Stephanie Davis, and the six attorneys involved in this case [James Mellon, Jeffrey Clark, Charles Browning, Warren White, Zenna Elhasan, and Davidde Stella (respectively named “DOES #1 through #6”)]⁷, as being all common members of the very same State BAR of Michigan. Moreover, **the 92-year old Avern Cohn – who has tortuously and criminally acted with dereliction, gross negligence, misfeasance, and/or malfeasance, in the face of both “*show cause*” writ(s) and “*order*” for his “*competency hearing*,” to continually allow “*repeated frauds*” to be persistently perpetuated and compounded upon this “*Article III Court of Record*” by his fellow State BAR of Michigan members – was also formally named as a**

⁷ Despite their affirmative participation in the “*proceedings*” of this case for these past 16 months as shown by their paperwork to this Article III Court of Record, Elhasan and Browning have never entered any formal “*Appearance*” to this Court as their own protocols otherwise instruct them to do according to their own Court Rules.

“*judicial usurper*” based upon his “*pattern and practice*” of “*affirmative*” acts of inaction on this case, when the “*call to duty*” under his Oath of Office, under his lifetime assigned position as an Article III “*judge,*” under 18 U.S.C. § 4 (“*Misprision of Felony*”), and under 18 U.S.C. § 2382 (“*Misprision of Treason*”) had otherwise required him to act affirmatively in a much different way, in the interest of the National Security of (“*We*”) the People of the United States of America.

In light of these compounded criminal offenses, being committed and covered up by a widespread crime syndicate amounting to “*Domestic Terrorism*” as defined by Congress, the United States Secretary of State, and the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI), Private Attorney Generals/Co-Grievants David Schied and Cornell Squires entered the following documents, being hereby RE-ENTERED into this instant Article III Court of Record, being incorporated again here by reference as “EXHIBITS” which had been timely “*served*” upon the so-called *U.S. District Court* by mail on 9/12/16 and time-stamped as “*received*” and “*filed*” by the “*Court*” on 9/13/16:

- 1) **“EXHIBIT #1”** – captioned as (Sworn and Notarized) “*(United States Department of Justice) ‘Complaint: Alleging Failure of Department of Justice Employee to Provide Rights to a Crime Victim Under the Crime*

Victims' Rights Act of 2004" (4 pages of USDOJ "form" complaint plus 1 page of "*Jurats' Notarization and Authentication Page*" with notary seal)

- a) This document references and underscores the "**Exhibit A**" to the previously filed "*Order of Default Judgment....and...Objection to Criminally Accused Stephanie Davis 'Report and Recommendation....*" to which the co-Defendants filed their recent "*Response(s)*" and to which this instant action is filed in "*Reply*" by PAGs Schied and Squires;
- b) "**Exhibit A**" of the "**Order of Default Judgment....**" filing contained **61 "unrebutted sworn and notarized Affidavits"** as "**exhibits**" of Evidence;
- c) The "*Complaint: Alleging Failure....Crime Victims' Rights Act of 2004*" also references the "*Sworn and Notarized Criminal Complaint of David Schied (2/10/10)*" which appeared as one of the 61 "**exhibits of Evidence**" contained in "**Exhibit A**" of that previous filing of "*Order of Default Judgment....*", which can be located at:

http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/082516_MyDefaultJudgmntFolwupCrimeRpt&MemofPeoplesRights/MyExhibits/Exhibits2AffidavitFollowUp/EX_24_2010SwornCrimComplaint_compreh2SixthCirAGHolder.pdf

- d) The content of the "*Sworn and Notarized Criminal Complaint of David Schied (2/10/10)*" contained 49 pages of explicitly named people, events, and crimes committed by the categorized list of people associated with the

offices of the Wayne and Washtenaw prosecutors, the Michigan State Police, the Northville Police Department, the Wayne and Washtenaw sheriffs' departments, the Wayne County Circuit Court, the Ingham County Circuit Court, the Michigan Supreme Court, the Office of the Michigan Attorney General, the Office of the Michigan Attorney General, the Office of multiple U.S. Attorney(s) for the Eastern District of Michigan, the FBI and numerous other offices associated with the United States Department of Justice (USDOJ) including the two U.S. Attorney Generals holding office prior to USAG Loretta Lynch, the Michigan Court of Appeals, the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

- e) The "*Complaint: Alleging Failure....Crime Victims' Rights Act of 2004*" also referenced the dereliction of the current U.S. Attorney Barbara McQuade and her minions of "*assistants*" when disregarding and/or rejecting numerous previous criminal complaints and demands for forwarding these criminal complaints to the federal "*special grand jury*" as required under 18 U.S.C. § 3332.
- 2) **"EXHIBIT #2"** – This exhibit of Evidence contains eleven (11) separate sets of documents (i.e., one page of "*Criminal Complaint*" followed by one "*Jurats' Notarization and Authentication Page*" constituting one separate set), with

EACH of the eleven sets captioned as “(United States District Court) ‘Criminal Complaint’.”

a) Each of the eleven (11) sets of “Criminal Complaints” alleged the following minimum number of crimes as listed below in direct quote:

1. 18 U.S.C. § 4 – “*Misprision of Felony*”;
2. 18 U.S.C. § 2382 – “*Misprision of Treason*”;
3. 18 U.S.C. § 242 – “*Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law*”;
4. 18 U.S.C. § 241 – “*Conspiracy Against Rights*”;
5. 18 U.S.C. § 1341 – “*Frauds and Swindles*”
6. 18 U.S.C. § 1505 – “*Obstruction of Proceedings Before Departments, Agencies, and Committees*”;
7. 18 U.S.C. § 1512 – “*Tampering With a Witness, Victim, or an Informant*”;
8. 18 U.S.C. § 1513 – “*Retaliating Against a Witness, Victim, or an Informant*.”

b) The above-listed criminal claims were applied as listed on EACH of the “Criminal Complaints” that were being filed against EACH of the following individuals in their private capacities (i.e., each set of 2-page “Criminal Complaint + “Jurats’ Notarization and Authentication” is included again herein as “**Exhibit #2,**” being one set for each of the following named people:

1. Avern Cohn – 92-year old U.S. District Court “*judicial usurper*”;
2. Michael Hluchaniuk – (now retired) USDC “*magistrate usurper*”;
3. Stephanie Davis – USDC “*magistrate usurper*”;
4. David Weaver – USDC “‘*clerk-of-the-court*’ *usurper*”;

5. John Clark – Michigan “Assistant Attorney General” and “‘*officer of the court*’ usurper”
6. James Mellon – “DOE #1” and USDC “‘*officer of the court*’ usurper”;
7. Jeffrey Clark – “DOE #2” and USDC “‘*officer of the court*’ usurper”;
8. Charles Browning – “DOE #3” and USDC “‘*officer of the court*’ usurper”;
9. Warren White – “DOE #4” and USDC “‘*officer of the court*’ usurper”;
10. Zenna Elhasan – “DOE #5” and USDC “‘*officer of the court*’ usurper”;
11. Davidde Stella – “DOE #6” and USDC “‘*officer of the court*’ usurper”;

These “*Criminal Complaints*”⁸ and “*Complaint: Alleging Failure....Crime Victims’ Rights Act of 2004,*”⁹ formalized by entry into this Article III Court of Record on “*form*” documents formally created and recognized by the “United States” and/or the “UNITED STATES” (if there is a difference between the two in terms of identification of the “*person*” in commerce), were preceded in this case history by two previous sworn and notarized “*criminal complaints*” written in “*Affidavit*” format, each being entered into this Article III Court of Record as

⁸ Found online in the Article III Court of Record at:
http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/091216_3rdLetrwithCriminalComplaints2USDOJLynch/USDC CriminalComplaints-ELEVEN-11-2ppEACH.pdf

⁹ Found online in the Article III Court of Record at:
http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/091216_3rdLetrwithCriminalComplaints2USDOJLynch/USDOJComplaintFailofDOJemployee2p rovideVictimsRights-4pp.pdf

found below in reference to the “*cover pages*” of these documents “*filed*” with the Court prior to the “*Order*” and “*Judgment*” of “*dismissal*” that was supposedly “*signed*” (digitally by use of “/s/” followed by his typewritten name) by Avern Cohn.¹⁰

The Tactic Used to “Dismiss” the 16-Month Old Case, Being Supposedly Done by Avern Cohn, Exemplifies the Criminal Intent of the “Clerk(s) of the Court,” the (Two) “Magistrate(s),” and the So-Called “Judge,” to Commit “Treason” – an Allegation that is far from being “Frivolous”

“*Prima facie*” – on its face – the so-called “Memorandum and Order” digitally “*signed*” by the so-called “*judge*” Avern Cohn is *fraudulent* as presented in the context of the accompanying “Judgment of Dismissal” that is digitally “*signed*” by the so-called “*Clerk*” David Weaver and his “*Deputy Clerk*,” Marie Valinde. (See **“EXHIBIT #3”** as containing the “Memorandum and Order” and its

¹⁰ There remains question as to whether Avern Cohn is actually carrying out these aspects of the “*domestic terrorism*” himself or intentionally allowing his name and “*independent*” position as a lifetime-employed Article III “*judge*” to be used as the bludgeoning tool for his fellow State BAR of Michigan members to act criminally “*under color of law*.” The basis for this questioning is in the FACT that, thus far, Cohn has disregarded Private Attorney General (“PAG”) Schied’s and PAG Squires’ previous two “Writ(s) for Show Cause” and subsequent “Order for Competency Hearing” as time-stamped with the District Court on 6/21/16 and found as “*filed*” in the Article III Court of Record at:

http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/062016_Writ4SshowCauseonMot2StayProceedings+Order4JudgeCompetencyHearing/062116_Ti-me-StampedCvrPages.pdf

accompanying “*Judgment of Dismissal*” as published on 9/12/16.)¹¹ **While the face of the “Memorandum and Order” purports to “Deny Pending Motions as Moot,” the “Judgment of Dismissal” purports to “Adjudge[d] that defendants’ [multiple] motions for summary judgment is granted,” which is a circumstantial impossibility.** In FACT, these documents demonstrate the addition of yet another criminal co-conspirator, **Marie Valinde**, as evidence that the *domestic terrorism* network increases in ever-expanding fashion in response to reports of *treason*, instead of shrinking under the required *fiduciary* scrutiny. (Bold emphasis)

The Evidence screams of the blatant undermining of constitutional violations of due process and access to the Court, not only for Grievants/PAGs/Claimants David Schied and Cornell Squires, but also for all fourteen (14) of the “joinder” Grievants/Claimants that lawfully entered into this Common Law case with their own Sworn and Notarized Statements against the Defendant(s) Charter County of Wayne and their “*errors and omissions*” and “*terrorism*” insurance coverage mega-company, American Insurance Group (“AIG”) which has long been alleged to be engaged in the same type of “*pattern and practice*” as the federal “*actors*” operating what is otherwise called the “*United States District Court*,” and with

¹¹ These filings are also located online in the “*Article III Court of Record*” as found at: http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/091216_USDCFraudCASEDISMISSAL&My11OfficialCrimeReports/USDCCDismissal.pdf

what is otherwise supposed to be an “*independent*” Article III judge entitled to “*lifetime-employment.*”

Not so coincidentally, the “*Memorandum and Order*” is nothing more nor less than a repetition of the “*MMRMA’S Response to ‘Plaintiff’s’ Objections (Dkt. #142) to the Report and Recommendation*” that was filed by Defendant “*DOE #1,*” being James Mellon, attorney of the Mellon-Pries law firm for the Michigan Municipal Risk Management Authority (“MMRMA”), against whom criminal allegations have been pending since the two weeks after this federal case had begun in late May and early June of 2015. In fact, Mellon’s filing of “*MMRMA’s Response...Report and Recommendation*” was filed on 9/8/16 (i.e., see “**EXHIBIT #4**” for the cover page of Mellon’s filing)¹² and the publishing of the “*Memorandum and Order*” and accompanying “*Judgment of Dismissal*” – **just four days later** (with a weekend in between) on 9/12/16 – was clearly by design, to deny Grievants/PAGs/Claimants David Schied and Cornell Squires the ability to timely respond to that filing by Mellon. **It is thus obvious then, that Avern Cohn and his “agents” CRIMINALLY used the elements of Mellon’s filing against all of the “joinder” claimants UNDER COLOR OF LAW.** (Bold emphasis)

¹² Note that the entirety of Mellon’s filing – minus case law exhibits – is posted in the Article III Court of Record located at:

http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/091216_USDCFraudCASEDISMISSAL&My11OfficialCrimeReports/JamesMellonResp.pdf

Significantly, the “Memorandum and Order” and accompanying “Judgment of Dismissal” (hereafter referred to as “Order and Judgment”), which also purports to prohibit Grievant/PAG/Claimant David Schied from filing anything more into the federal court without first asking “*permission*” from these alleged “*domestic terrorists*,” includes the following significant OMISSIONS and/or FALSE STATEMENTS while creating yet another “*official*” court document of FRAUDULENCE:

- 1) Avern Cohn fraudulently mischaracterized the case as a “*prisoner civil rights case*” when, in fact it was presented as a case of “*domestic terrorism*” in which “*Civil Rights*” and “*Common Law Tort [and] Malicious Trespass*” claims were both otherwise established. **The initial filing was clear in that the actions of “*the accused*” constituted a “State-Created Danger” by unlawful “*seizure*,” “*kidnapping*” and “*false imprisonment*,” and that the acts of the co-Defendants were of such egregious nature as to “*shock the conscience*” of witnesses who provided Sworn and Notarized Affidavits demonstrating that the named Defendants had no subject matter or personal jurisdiction whatsoever. The “Complaint/Claim of Damages” alleged that the so-called “*Judgement*” was fraudulently presented to the Midland County Sheriff’s Department to enforce false imprisonment while denied to David Schied and all others involved in seeking court records about the unlawful**

***kidnapping* so as to seek “*appeal,*” “*habeas corpus,*” “*set aside,*” or any other practical civil legal remedy.** (Bold emphasis)

- 2) Avern Cohn fraudulently omitted the FACT that Grievant/PAG/Claimant David Schied had initially filed his case in Common Law as an “*individual,*” defining himself as a “*private American national*” and not as a “*pro se*” litigant. Moreover, shortly after filing his case and throughout the near entirety of the subsequent 16 months of filings – David Schied referred to himself as “*Grievant,*” as “*Claimant,*” and as “*Private Attorney General*” acting in the public’s interest along with Cornell Squires in bringing in fourteen (14) other “*joinder*” cases against the co-Defendants of the “*Charter County of Wayne*” and their \$100 BILLION insurance policy issued by The Insurance Company for the State of Pennsylvania (“ICSOP”) and their corporate parent “*shell*” and underwriter American Insurance Group (“AIG”).
- 3) Avern Cohn fraudulently omitted that PAGs David Schied and Cornell Squires had filed documents into the Article III Court of Record calling attention to the FACT that the “*Redford Defendants*” attorney Jeffrey Clark (named as “DOE #2”) could not properly represent both “*individuals*” and an alleged “*crime syndicate*” otherwise fraudulently presenting itself to the Court as a quasi-government or “*public*” entity when the case law presented by PAGs Schied’s

and Squires' filings showed a distinct conflict of interest and the need for the individuals named to hire their own legal representatives.

- 4) Avern Cohn fraudulently presented a footnote in claim that “*Plaintiff has been a prolific pro se filer,*” naming “*several cases*” in which Grievant David Schied had placed clear Evidence into the Article III Court of Record that the rulings of these previous cases were issued by fraudulence of the so-called “*judges*” in those cases, that rivaled the fraudulence committed by the so-called “*judge*” herein, with all being members of the very same “*State BAR of Michigan*” domestic terrorist organization. Importantly, it was those four (4) mounds of “*substantive prima facie evidence*” that the first “*magistrate*” assigned to this instant case sought to procedurally “*strike,*” causing Grievant/PAG/Claimant David Schied to file an “*Interlocutory Appeal*”¹³ and “*Memorandum of Law.*”¹⁴

¹³ This filing, captioned “*GRIEVANT DAVID SCHIED'S 'WRIT OF MANDAMUS IN ORDER FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL' WITH ACCOMPANYING 'MEMORANDUM AT LA W' AND QUESTIONS OF LAW ON ACTION TAKEN BY THE COURT THAT CONCLUSIVELY RESOLVED A CLAIMED RIGHT BY PROCEDURAL 'MOTION'. THAT IS EFFECTIVELY UNREVIEWABLE ON APPEAL OF FINAL JUDGEMENT BUT WHICH IS COLLATERAL TO THE SUBSTANTIVE MERITS OF THE FILINGS 'STRICKEN' AND HAS A FINAL AND IRREPARABLE EFFECT ON THE CASE*” is located online in the “*Article III Court of Record*” as found at: http://cases.michigan.constitutional.gov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/111815_WritMandamusInterlocAppeal&MemorandumLaw/EntireWritofMandamus4InterlocutoryAppeal.pdf

¹⁴ This filing, captioned “*GRIEVANT DAVID SCHIED'S 'MEMORANDUM OF LAW' IN SUPPORT OF GRIEVANT'S 'WRIT OF MANDAMUS FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL'*”) WITH QUESTIONS OF LAW PERTAINING TO

Those filings (of “Writ of Mandamus for Interlocutory Appeal...” and “Memorandum of Law...”) cited a plethora of case law showing the “*Separation of Powers*” violations that had been occurring in “*pattern and practice*” by procedural dismissals of these previous cases using judicial “*rules*” in the face of substantive criminal allegations warranting “*any judge*” to pursue criminal investigations and prosecutions as mandated by State legislation.

- 5) Avern Cohn fraudulently misrepresented that “*the matter was referred to a magistrate for pretrial proceedings*” when in FACT, “*the matter*” had been referred to TWO MAGISTRATES, the first which quit his job (or was fired) in the face of Grievant Schied’s written “*objection*” and subsequent filing of “Writ of Mandamus for Interlocutory Appeal,” of “Memorandum of Law,” and “Replacement” filings for EACH of the substantive filings that had been unlawfully “*stricken*” by the first so-called “*magistrate*” Michael Hluchaniuk.
- 6) Avern Cohn fraudulently omitted the FACT that soon after the second “*magistrate,*” Stephanie Davis, was appointed, an objection was formally filed

WHETHER JUDICIAL ‘LEGISLATION’ IS CONSTITUTIONAL; AND WHETHER JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE AUTHORIZES “BAD” BEHAVIOR; AND WHETHER ‘SUBSTANTIVE’ EVIDENCE CAN BE ‘PROCEDURALLY’ STRICKEN; AND WHETHER EVIDENCE OF A ‘PATTERN & PRACTICE’ OF GOVERNMENT COERCION CONSTITUTES TREASON AND/OR ‘DOMESTIC TERRORISM’” is located online in the “Article III Court of Record” as found at: http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/111815_WritMandamusInterlocAppeal&MemorandumLaw/EntireMemorandumofLaw.pdf

barring this second “Article I” administrative magistrate from any further interference with this Article III judicial case.

- 7) Avern Cohn fraudulently omitted all Common Law claims from his listing of what “*the Complaint*” presented in claims.
- 8) Avern Cohn fraudulently misrepresented that the “*essential terms*” of the claims about “*an incident on June 8th, 2012*” was that “*District Court Judge Karen Khalil held him in contempt of court and ordered plaintiff to serve 30 days in jail*” when the Evidence of Sworn and Notarized Witness Statements presented with the initial filing of “Complaint/Claim of Damages” made clear that the “*incident*” was a full-blown domestic terrorist event by which the “*judge*” had NO JURISDICTION to do anything to or order anything against “*Claimant*” David Schied, and which otherwise demonstrated how Defendant Khalil and her co-Defendants turned the peaceful public courtroom into their own personal forum for the alter-ego expression of unrestrained power and corrupt tyranny.
- 9) Avern Cohn fraudulently misrepresented the terms for “*injunctive relief*” in a footnote as relating to “*42 U.S.C. §§ 1981, 1982, 1985 and 1988*” when in FACT the “Complaint/Claim of Damages” verbatim stated:

“[The] allegations as cited above, supported by sworn and notarized Affidavit (i.e., see ‘EXHIBIT D’), if accepted as true as stated, facially provide “reasonable cause” to believe that one or more of the Defendants committed crimes; being specifically the crimes as defined by Chapter LXVIIA (Act 328 of 1931) of Michigan’s Penal Code, which defines ‘human trafficking’ under MCL 750.462a, as ‘coercion,’ ‘force,’ ‘abusing the legal system’ ‘kidnapping’ and ‘false imprisonment.’”

*[These] allegations, as supported by sworn and notarized Affidavit (i.e., see again 'Exhibit D'), if accepted as true as stated, **facially provide 'reasonable cause' to believe that, because Plaintiff's allegations and evidence pertain to a cross-categorical spectrum of government actors – consisting of judges, clerks, court administrators, bailiffs, prosecutors, lawyers, and police which have interagency employment ties in both the judicial and executive branches of local, county, and state government – there is also reasonable cause to consider this interplay of individual actions and interests characteristic of criminal racketeering and corruption.***

*[These] allegations, as supported by sworn and notarized Affidavit (i.e., see again 'Exhibit D'), if accepted as true as stated, **facially provide reasonable cause to believe that Defendants are committing acts of domestic terrorism by individual usurping public functionary positions and acting under color of law.***

*[These] allegations, as supported by sworn and notarized Affidavit (i.e., see again "Exhibit D"), if accepted as true as stated, **facially provide reasonable cause to believe that Defendants are:***

- a) failing their constitutional duties to properly record, document, and archive their court, police, township, and county activities; and/or*
- b) blatantly misrepresenting to the public what activities are recorded or not recorded, and/or,*
- c) committing other forms of misrepresentation and fraud in the content of the "official" records and other documents they are manufacturing.*

[That Grievant David Schied] has alleged himself to be a crime victim; thus, the following state statutes are called into play in this case:

- a) MCL 18.351-[Crime Victim's Compensation Board (definitions)] which defines a "Crime": "(c) '**Crime**' means an act that is 1 of the following: (i) A crime under the laws of this state or the United States that causes an injury within this state. (ii) An act committed in another state that if committed in this state would constitute a crime under the laws of this state or the United States, that causes an injury within this state or that causes an injury to a resident of this state within a state that does not have a victim compensation program eligible for funding from the victims of crime act of 1984, chapter XIV of title II of the comprehensive crime control act of 1984, Public Law 98-473 98 Stat. 2170."*
- b) MCR Rule 6.101 (Rules of the Court) holds that. "A **complaint is described as a written accusation that a named or described person has committed a specified criminal offense. The complaint must include the substance of the accusation against the accused and the name and statutory citation of the offense. (B)(Signature and Oath) The complaint must be signed and sworn to before a judicial officer or court clerk...."***
- c) MCL 761.1 and MCL 750.10 describes an "**indictment**" as "**a formal written complaint or accusation written under Oath affirming that one or more crimes have been committed and names the person or persons guilty of the offenses**".*

- d) *MCL 767.3 holds that at the least. "The **complaint SHALL give probable cause for any judge of law and of record to suspect that such offense or offenses have been committed...and that such complaint SHALL warrant the judge to direct an inquiry into the matters relating to such complaint**".*
- e) *MCL 764.1(a) holds that, "A **magistrate SHALL issue a warrant** upon presentation of a proper complaint alleging the commission of an offense and a finding of reasonable cause to believe that the individual or individuals accused in the complaint committed the offense"*
- f) *MCL 764.1(b) calls for an "**arrest without delay**". (Bold emphasis) [That] [a]dditionally, Wayne County Code Sec. 1-12 ("Aiding and abetting violations") states, "Whenever any act or omission is a violation of this code, or of any rule or regulation thereunder, any person who causes, secures, aids or abets may be prosecuted...and punished as if he committed such violation." [That Grievant], thus having formalized by sworn and notarized written accusation naming the people and the crimes committed against him; and having establishing "reasonable cause" to believe that the named crimes had actually been committed by Defendants, and thus establishing "probable cause for any judge of law and of record to suspect that such offense or offenses have been committed," demands a judgment Order of Injunction for the following:

 - a) *That, beginning immediately, all Defendants should institute an independent audit of the accuracy of their recordkeeping, to include all records, related to court, police, and county proceedings and report those findings openly to the public, to the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan, and to the Wayne County Fraud and Corruption Investigation Unit of the Office of the Wayne County Prosecutor referenced by the Wayne County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 73 (Fraud Investigation Policy), Section 3 (Policy established);*
 - b) *That such audit will include an open solicitation by Defendants to all of the communities of Defendant Wayne County, in request of allegations, complaints or reports of previous complaints filed in any court operating in Wayne County, pertaining to inaccurate or fraudulent recordkeeping and/or the manufacturing of fraudulent documents.*
 - c) *That a federal special grand jury be convened, as required under 18 U.S.C. §3332, to independently answer to the duty of special grand jurors to inquire into the offenses of the criminal laws of the United States, and to which information about the alleged crimes, the identities of the alleged perpetrators, and the alleged evidence can be properly submitted for criminal investigation and prosecuting.**

10) Avern Cohn used yet another footnote to fraudulently mischaracterize

Claimant/PAG Cornell Squires' civil and criminal allegations and the 14 other

sets of *joinder claimants/crime victims*’ civil and criminal allegations together as “*submitted by non-filers.*”

- a) Cohn did this while convoluting those substantive *domestic terrorism* allegations and claims against Defendant “*Charter County of Wayne*” and their insurance carriers (Defendants “ICSOP” and “AIG”);
- b) Cohn essentially dismissed those allegations – again without *litigation of the merits* and thus depriving these people, again, of their First Amendment Right to Access the Court through their “*backward-looking*” claims against the judges operating their respective racketeering operations through the court systems being operated by the Defendant Charter County of Wayne in conjunction with the crime syndicate of the State BAR of Michigan;
- c) Moreover, Cohn also did this while entirely CRIMINALLY disregarding other significant documents augmenting the civil and criminal claims of these other lawfully “*enjoined*” claimants, grievants, and crime victims.

These documents are listed as follows by “*Exhibit*” reference to their cover pages and by reference to their location on the Internet where they can be found in their entirety in the Article III Court of Record:

1. “CLAIMANTS / GRIEVANTS / CRIME VICTIMS AND PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERALS 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 OF 'MEMORANDUM OF LAW'” (See **“EXHIBIT #5”**)

as the cover page filed in the District Court of the United States)
As found in its entirety online at:

http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/033116_PAGsSchied&Squires_Joinderof-14-ClaimantsCrimeVictims/CoverFiling&MemorandumofLaw/PAGIntro2EnjoinmentofCases.pdf

2. “GRIEVANTS / PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERALS / NEXT FRIENDS DAVID SCHIED'S AND CORNELL SQUIRES' 'MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF 'JOINDER' CLAIMS OF CONSTITUTIONAL & COMMON LAW TORTS BASED ON THE FIRST AMENDMENT PETITION CLAUSE AND EVIDENCE OF DOMESTIC TERRORISM” (See “**EXHIBIT #6**” as the cover page filed in the District Court of the United States) As found in its entirety online at:

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

- 11) Avern Cohn’s fraudulent “Memorandum and Order” carried out an intentionally misleading discussion of “*magistrate*” Stephanie Davis’ “*sua sponte Report and Recommendation*” to summarily dismiss Grievant/PAG/Claimant/Crime Victim David Schied’s “Complaint/Claim of Damages” ADMINISTRATIVELY and without any *judicial* process whatsoever. This action mimics and demonstrates the *pattern and practice* described by ALL Grievants, Claimants, and Crime Victims who were *enjoined* in the case several months ago, each by UNREBUTTED “Sworn and Notarized Affidavits.”

12) Cohn's "Memorandum and Order" is thus fraudulent with regard to his criminal cohort, Stephanie Davis, because Cohn fraudulently omitted the UNREBUTTED "Sworn and Notarized Affidavits and Crime Reports" associated with the following documents previously filed in this Article III Court of Record:

- a) "PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERALS ('PAGs') DAVID SCHIED'S AND CORNELL SQUIRES' WRIT OF ERROR and CRIMINAL COMPLAINT' AGAINST 'ORDER' AND OTHER ACTS OF DERELICTION AND 'CONSPIRACY TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT' AS COMMITTED ON OR ABOUT 6/30/16 BY MAGISTRATE STEPHANIE DAVIS" – (See "**EXHIBIT #7**" as the time-stamped Cover Page for this document.) This document can be found online in the Article III Court of record at: http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/071916_WritofErroronMagisFraudOrdertoRespond/071916_WritofErroronStephanieDavis_ALL+CertServ.pdf
- b) "SWORN AFFIDAVIT AND CRIME REPORT OF DAVID SCHIED 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". (See "**EXHIBIT #8**" as the time-stamped Cover Page for this document.) This document can be found online in the Article III Court of record at: http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/071916_WritofErroronMagisFraudOrdertoRespond/ExhibitsProvingCrimes061916/EXH_A_071816_SWORNAFFIDAVITOFDAVIDSCHIED.pdf
- c) "SWORN AFFIDAVIT AND CRIME REPORT OF CORNELL SQUIRES 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" – (See "**EXHIBIT #9**" as the time-stamped Cover Page for this document.) This document can be found online in the Article III Court of record at: http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/071916_WritofErroronMagisFraudOrdertoRespond/ExhibitsProvingCrimes061916/EXH_B_071816_SWORNAFFIDAVITOFORNELLSQUIRES.pdf
- d) "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” – (See **“EXHIBIT #10”** as the time-stamped Cover Page for this document.) This document can be found online in the Article III Court of record at: http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEdM/082516_MyDefaultJudgmntFolwupCrimeRpt&MemofPeoplesRights/MyExhibits/EX_A_SwornFollowUpAffidavit2Lynchwith42AffidavitLinks.pdf

- 13) Cohn’s fraudulent **“Memorandum and Order”** as well as the **“Judgment of Dismissal”** issued by the so-called **“*Clerk of the Court,*”** a criminal co-conspirator in the formalized **“Criminal Complaint”** (i.e., see again **“Exhibit #1”**) David Weaver, as also **“signed”** by Marie Verlinde are BOTH **“administrative”** actions and not **“judicial.”** Notably, even as shown by case law, **“a judge is not immune from liability for nonjudicial actions, i.e., actions not taken in the judge’s judicial capacity.”** *Mireles*, 502 U.S. at 11 (citing *Forrester v. White*, 484 U.S. 219, 227–29 (1988))” (As cited in Grievant/PAG David Schied’s initial **“Complaint/Claim of Damages.”**
- 14) Cohn’s fraudulent **“Memorandum and Order”** claims that Grievant/PAG David Schied **“d[id] not address the magistrate judge’s recommendation;”** yet – *prima facie* – Cohn disregarded the content of the **“409-page...objections”** and summarily **“dismissed”** it in the same *pattern and practice* that he (and other state and federal so-called **“judges”** have been shown to) unlawfully **“strike”** or **“dismiss”** virtually ALL of Grievant David Schied’s previous filings for more than a decade since 2004 when PAG Schied first began uncovering a deep-

seated corruption and criminal racketeering within the so-called “government” rather than without it. Cohn reasons, “[Grievant] *provides no substantive objection to the magistrate judge’s recommendation. Under these circumstances, [Grievants/PAGs David Schied’s and Cornell Squires’] filing does not constitute a proper objection.*”

15) Indeed! As is shown by the time-stamped “Certificate of Service” (“**EXHIBIT #11**”) on the delivery of those purported “409 pages” of documents to “*Article III ‘lifetime employed judge’*” Cohn himself, as well as to the District Court of the United States, Cohn ignored and dismissed without “*litigation of the merits*” what was explicitly written in the following documents that were filed in “*objection*” of Stephanie Davis’ corrupt “Report and Recommendation” as an instrument for “*aiding and abetting*” in the “*predicate*” crimes “before the Court”:

- a) *"Private Attorney Generals ("PAGs ") David Scheid'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"*
- b) *"Denial of Any Proposed 'Substitution' of Defendant 'DOE' Charles 'No Appearance' Browning for 'DOE' Warren White as Attorney 'Representing' Co-Defendants 'AIG' and 'ICSOP '"*
- c) *""Objection' to 'Criminally Accused' Stephenie Davis' 'Report and Recommendation' Sua Sponte Dismissal and Termination of All (9) Pending 'Motions' Based on 'More Fraud,'"*
- d) *"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 Us. 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;"

- e) ***"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."***

16) Of course, all of the above followed the documents depicted below as time-stamped "filed" on 6/21/16 and presented by *cover page* as **"EXHIBIT #12"**:¹⁵

- a) *"Writ for Show Cause' in Response to Repeated Fraudulence Compounded by Court Clerks and Other 'Judicial Officers'"*;
- b) *"'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'"*;
- c) *"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"*;

17) And, of course, all of the above followed the previously-filed "simplified" 2-page formal filing that previous month, on or about 5/14/16, of *"Grievants'*

¹⁵ The entirety of this filing, along with all of the accompanying "Exhibits," and the co-Defendant documents to which this filing addresses, are all located online in the Article III Court of Record at:

http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/062016_Writ4SshowCauseonMot2StayProceedings+Order4JudgeCompetencyHearing/

[‘David Schied and Others Similarly Situated’] Second (2nd) Decline to Magistrate Judge [Article I] Jurisdiction.” (See **“EXHIBIT #13”**)¹⁶

- 18) Avern Cohn’s fraudulent “Memorandum and Order” clearly give overriding precedence to the “*defendants agree[ing] that [Grievants’] objections [were purportedly] not in a proper form and that Heck [case law] applies and bars plaintiff’s claims [for this Common Law proceeding in an Article III Court of Record]*” Meanwhile, **Cohn disregarded the FACT that attorneys cannot testify, that the “merits” – of the UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVITS submitted by Grievants/PAGs/Claimants/Crime Victims David Schied, Cornell Squires, and all of the other “joinder” litigants – had not ever been litigated before the “trial jury” as demanded by the initial filing on “the matter.”**
- 19) Cohn’s administrative “Memorandum and Order” is blatantly fraudulent because it wholly disregards the “*substance*” of all of the above-referenced filings while wholly accepting Stephanie Davis’ fraudulent “Report and Recommendation” with reference to the “*Heck*” case. Cohn then used *administrative procedure* to override his substantive judicial obligation to otherwise investigate and litigate the CRIMES reported to him by at least 16 flesh-and-blood individuals, as he was otherwise commanded to do by

¹⁶ This document is located in the Article III Court of Record at: http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/051616_Object2AssignofMagistrate/Objection2AssignofMagistrate.pdf

Michigan statutes and United States codes and rules governing what “*any judge*” should do with such reports and information about crimes.

CONTROLLING OR MOST APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY FOR RELIEF

In the history of case filings over the past 16 months since this case was filed in the District Court of the United States and a “*Claim of Damages*” was first established against the \$100 BILLION *terrorism* insurance carriers and the *risk management* insurance company of “*the criminally accused*” co-Defendants operating as the “*Charter County of Wayne*” and the “*Municipal Township of Redford*,” there have been three important legal “*Memorandums*” filed chock full of relevant state and federal legislation, case law, constitutional mandates, and common law history. These three *memorandums*, as listed below along with their respective “*Table of Contents*” as evidentiary *Exhibits of Evidence* all constitute the “*controlling or most appropriate authority*” for relief of this case.

These memorandums, listed in the order in which they were properly recorded into the instant Article III Court of Record, are as follows:

- 1) **Memorandum #1** – “*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 Constitution; and 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.’*”

- a) **“EXHIBIT #14”** is the cover page and *“Table of Contents”* and concise statements of *“Questions Presented”* for this 41-page filing, time-stamped by the federal court on 11/18/15.
 - b) The entirety of this filing can be found online in the Article III Court of Record at: http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/111815_WritMandamusInterlocAppeal&MemorandumLaw/EntireMemorandumofLaw.pdf
- 2) **Memorandum #2** – *“Grievants/Private Attorney Generals / Next Friends David Schied’s and Cornell Squires’ ‘Memorandum of Law in Support of ‘Joinder’ Claims of Constitutional & Common Law Torts Based on the First Amendment Petition Clause and Evidence of Domestic Terrorism.”*
- a) **“EXHIBIT #15”** is the cover page and *“Table of Contents”* for this 66-page filing, time-stamped by the federal court on 3/31/16.
 - b) The entirety of this filing can be found online in the Article III Court of Record at: http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/033116_PAGsSchied&Squires_Joinderof-14-ClaimantsCrimeVictims/CoverFiling&MemorandumofLaw/MemorandumofLaw/MemorandumofLawonBLACclaimsonJoinderClaimants_AL.pdf
- 3) **Memorandum #3** – *“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 Laws of Commerce’ – In Evidence and Support of Acts of Self-Defense, and Responses to the Unconstitutional Denial of First Amendment Right to Redress of Grievances Regarding Previous ‘Backward-Looking-Access-to-Court’ Claims.”*
- a) **“EXHIBIT #16”** is the cover page and *“Table of Contents”* for this 183-page filing, time-stamped by the federal court on 8/25/16.
 - b) The entirety of this filing can be found online in the Article III Court of Record at: http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/082516_MyDefaultJudgmntFolwupCrimeRpt&MemofPeoplesRights/MyExhibits/EXB_MemorandumofPeoplesRights_KhalilCase.pdf
- 4) Other controlling laws, as referenced in the above memorandums include:

18 U.S.C. § 4; 18 U.S.C. § 2382; 18 U.S.C. § 242; 18 U.S.C. § 241; 18 U.S.C. § 1341; 18 U.S.C. § 1505; 18 U.S.C. § 1512; 18 U.S.C. § 1513; and the Crime Victims' Rights Act of 2004, and Constitution of Michigan of 1963 (Art. I, § 24 – “Rights of Crime Victims”).

LEDGER OF “COUNTS” IN COMMERCE DEPICTING DEBTS NOW OWED TO DAVID SCHIED, AND TO EACH OF THE “JOINDER” GRIEVANTS/CLAIMANTS/CRIME VICTIMS BY EACH OF THE ABOVE-NAMED PEOPLE AND ADDITIONALLY OWED BY THE “DISTRICT COURT” AND THE “UNITED STATES”

PAGs/Grievants Schied and Squires have documented in their previous filings of this Article III Court of Record their notices upon all of the “*officers*” of this United States District Court, being all jointly and severally members of the save State BAR of Michigan, that not only are debts owed to all of the Grievants, including the “*joinder*” Grievants as Claimants and Crime Victims, but also to **Private Attorney Generals David Schied and Cornell Squires** by the FACT that they were working on each of these filings in the public’s interest. Thus, as each person is accountable for the “*aiding and abetting*” in the “*secondary*” level (or factually speaking, for the third, fourth, or higher level) of crimes of a grand *conspiracy* to cover-up the *predicate* level of crimes, they **EACH are additionally culpable for the “*original*” debt claimed of \$150 MILLION** against the \$100 BILLION “*terrorism*” insurance policy as being “*accessories after the fact.*”

“To assist someone in committing or encourage someone to commit a crime. Generally, an aider and abettor is criminally liable to the same extent as the principal. Also called "aid or abet" and "counsel and procure." Stoneridge Inv. Partners, LLC, v. Scientific-Atlanta, Inc. 552 U.S. 148 (2008)

31 CFR (Code of Federal Regulations) §50.80 maintains,

(a) General. If the Secretary certifies an act as an act of terrorism pursuant to section 102 of the Act, there shall exist a Federal cause of action for property damage, personal injury, or death arising out of or resulting from such act of terrorism, pursuant to section 107 of the Act, which shall be the exclusive cause of action and remedy for claims for property damage, personal injury, or death arising out of or relating to such act of terrorism, except as provided in paragraph (c) of this section.

(b) Effective period. The exclusive Federal cause of action and remedy described in paragraph (a) of this section shall exist only for causes of action for property damage, personal injury, or death that arise out of or result from acts of terrorism that occur or occurred during the effective period of the Program.

(c) Rights not affected. Nothing in section 107 of the Act or this Subpart shall in any way:

(1) Limit the liability of any government, organization, or person who knowingly participates in, conspires to commit, aids and abets, or commits any act of terrorism;

(2) Affect any party's contractual right to arbitrate a dispute; or....

The Secretary of State's office and the FBI's website define “*domestic terrorism*” as in accordance with 18 U.S.C. § 2331 and 31 CFR 594.311 which state the following:

the term “domestic terrorism” means activities that—

(A) involve acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State; (B) appear to be intended—

(i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population; (ii) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or (iii) to affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping; and

(C) occur primarily within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

18 U.S.C. § 2331

The term terrorism means an activity that:

(a) Involves a violent act or an act dangerous to human life, property, or infrastructure; and

(b) *Appears to be intended:*

(1) *To intimidate or coerce a civilian population;*

(2) *To influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or*

(3) *To affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, kidnapping, or hostage-taking.* 31 CFR § 594.311

In 1913, the Supplement (Vol. 143, p.209)¹⁷ depicted that the case of Cochran v. Sess, 168 N.Y. 372, 61 N.E. 639 had defined “acts” that are “*dangerous to human life*” are being acts “*so threatening as to constitute an impending danger to persons in the enjoyment of their legitimate rights,*” and thus, allowed for determining the extent of defendant’s liability.

In the instant case, such liability is being levied against the performance bonds, blanket bonds, the risk management insurance, malpractice insurance, errors and omissions insurance, and/or terrorism insurance coverage or policy procured by each of the named thirteen (14) “persons” (i.e., “the accused”) to include the following: Avern Cohn, Michael Hluchaniuk, Stephanie Davis, David Weaver, Marie Verlinde¹⁸, John Clark, James Mellon, Jeffrey Clark, Warren White, Charles Browning, Zenna Elhasan, Davidde

¹⁷ This resource was located on 10/1/16 at:

[https://books.google.com/books?id=Zup-HC13YfoC&pg=PR5&lpg=PR5&dq=New+York+Supplement,+Vol.+143+\(1913\)&source=bl&ots=o3ZiBKIX3G&sig=g4y0u_Gvq0HNZYE-gvGW4CtGO0o&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwil1Oak_7vPAhWI4CYKHQ6ADewQ6AEIHDA#v=onepage&q=dangerous%20to%20human%20life&f=false](https://books.google.com/books?id=Zup-HC13YfoC&pg=PR5&lpg=PR5&dq=New+York+Supplement,+Vol.+143+(1913)&source=bl&ots=o3ZiBKIX3G&sig=g4y0u_Gvq0HNZYE-gvGW4CtGO0o&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwil1Oak_7vPAhWI4CYKHQ6ADewQ6AEIHDA#v=onepage&q=dangerous%20to%20human%20life&f=false)

¹⁸ Verlinde is the so-called “*Deputy Clerk*” to David Weaver whose electronic signature is found on the fraudulent “*Judgment of Dismissal*,” just below David Weaver’s name as the so-called “*Clerk of the Court*,” which is dated 9/12/16.

Stella, the State BAR of Michigan (of which each of the above are members), the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan (which supplied the means, the forum and the tools for domestic terrorist operations), and the UNITED STATES.

As provided by the accompanying sworn and notarized “Criminal Complaint” / “Affidavit and Brief of Information” constituting a “Claim in Commerce for Damages” (i.e., “EXHIBIT #17**”) the above-named individuals, as “*the accused,*” are EACH additionally liable for the following under the Law of Commerce:**

- 1) Operating and/or managing a “*continuing financial crimes enterprise*” as defined by 18 U.S. Code § 225 involving violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1341 (“*Frauds and Swindles*”) – \$10,000,000 (as an individual) and \$20,000,000 (as an organization) = **\$30,000,000 (30 million dollars) in subtotal owed to EACH individual Grievant/Claimant/Crime Victim;**
- 2) Sentencing of Fine for EACH of the above– listed Felony offenses as defined by 18 U.S.C. § 3571 of (not more than) \$250,000, being listed above and previous “Criminal Complaints” constituting, at minimum, eight (8) felony offenses = \$250,000 (times – “x”) 8 (felonies) = \$2,000,000 per person (times – “x”) 15 persons = **\$30,000,000 (30 million dollars) in subtotal owed to EACH individual Grievant/Claimant/Crime Victim;**

3) Sentencing of Fine for each infraction and/or violation in offense against the “Supreme Law of the Land” as the U.S. Constitution as defined by 18 U.S.C. § 3571 of (not more than) \$10,000, being listed herein and in “Exhibit #17,” per EACH of the 84 infractions per EACH of the 15 named “persons” calculates to \$10,000 x 84 x 15 = \$12,600,000 in subtotal owed by “the criminally accused” to PAG David Schied, and again \$12,600,000 more to EACH of the fourteen (14) other individual “joinder” litigants known as Grievants, Claimants and Crime Victims¹⁹;

4) The 84 “constitutional violations” referenced above have been broken down into the following codified sub-categories at \$10,000 each:

a) PROTECTION OF BASIC RIGHTS –

1. (AM1-FR) Each of the above-named “persons” as “the accused” have endorsed the “predicate” level of allegation of the “Complaint/Claim of Damages” that the “Defendants” named in this case had conspired to violate the religious freedoms of David Schied (and others accused in

¹⁹ Note that these subtotals still do not include the value additionally owed to each of David Schied and Cornell Squires as provided by law in the added ongoing value of attorney fees increasingly added to this calculation as based upon the time required for each Private Attorney General to act in this case “in the public’s interest” as provided by “Exhibit #5” as the previously-cited “Grievants/Private Attorney Generals/Next Friends David Schied’s and Cornell Squires’ Memorandum of Law in Support of ‘Joinder’ Claims of Constitutional and Common Law Torts Based on the First Amendment Petition Clause and Evidence of Domestic Terrorism.”

some fashion as being “*Moors*” and/or members of the “*Sovereign Citizens Domestic Terrorist Movement*”) – \$10,000;

2. (AM13.1/S,IS) Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the constitutional premise that Grievants/Claimants as Crime Victims should be forced to continuing in repeated filing of “*complaints*” and “*appeals*” by an ongoing “*conspiracy to deprive*” them, individually and collectively, of their rightful “*access to the court*”²⁰ – \$10,000;
3. (OTHER) – “*State Created Danger*” – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have acted through a “*pattern and practice*” of fraud, intentional malfeasance, dereliction, and other forms of obstruction and retaliation as listed in the above footnote, which have placed the Grievants/Claimants/Crime Victims into an even further danger, being publicly labeled – without warrant – as “*convicted,*” as “*vexatious,*” as “*frivolous filers,*” as “*paper terrorists,*” among other

²⁰ Note that such “*conspiracy to deprive*” involves “*the accused,*” individually and collectively, acting in and being liable for – **at minimum** – all of the list crimes of: 18 U.S.C. § 4 – “*Misprision of Felony*”; 18 U.S.C. § 2382 – “*Misprision of Treason*”; 18 U.S.C. § 242 – “*Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law*”; 18 U.S.C. § 241 – “*Conspiracy Against Rights*”; 18 U.S.C. § 1341 – “*Frauds and Swindles*”; 18 U.S.C. § 1505 – “*Obstruction of Proceedings Before Departments, Agencies, and Committees*”; 18 U.S.C. § 1512 – “*Tampering With a Witness, Victim, or an Informant*”; and 18 U.S.C. § 1513 – “*Retaliating Against a Witness, Victim, or an Informant*.”

defamatory names. This gives unjust rise to and unjust reason for “*law enforcement*” and “*courts*” to treat these people in like fashion, setting them up for further abuses and crimes against their constitutionally-guaranteed *unalienable* liberties – \$10,000;

b) GUARANTEES OF AN HONEST GOVERNMENT THAT GIVES FAIR AND EQUAL PROTECTION TO ALL –

1. (AM1/FS) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the constitutional premise that “*no law*” – including judge-created case law – “*shall limit*” the liberties of American nationals to “*freedom of speech,*” and the reporting of crimes to the proper “*authorities*”, particularly in light of such laws such as 18 U.S.C. § 4 (“*Misprision of Felony*”) and 18 U.S.C. § 2382 (“*Misprision of Treason*”) make it incumbent for all people to report such crimes and to speak in terms of telling “*the Truth, the whole Truth, and nothing but the Truth*” – \$10,000;
2. (AM1/FP) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the constitutional premise that the Grievants/Claimants/Crime Victims shall not be limited in their freedom to express their views, or their criminal allegations, in writing or by any form of printed

publication, particularly if they are truthful matters of fact back by evidence – \$10,000;

3. (AM6/INFO) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that the “*parties*” as Grievants, Claimants, and Crime Victims must be properly informed as to the nature and cause of any “*complaint*” prior to be placed on “*trial*” – or deprived of such trial – by the “*counter-parties*” when accusing Grievants/Claimants/Crime Victims of being “*vexatious litigants*,” “*frivolous filers*,” “*paper terrorists*,” “*Sovereign Citizens*” (implying “*domestic terrorists*”) or placing other harmful labels accusations upon them publicly as a matters of conclusive “*fact*” – \$10,000;
4. (AM6/WA) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that the “*parties*” as Grievants, Claimants, and Crime Victims must be properly “*confronted by all witnesses*” favoring the “*counter-parties*” when accusing Grievants/Claimants/Crime Victims of being “*vexatious litigants*,” “*frivolous filers*,” “*paper terrorists*,” “*Sovereign Citizens*” (implying “*domestic terrorists*”) or placing other harmful labels accusations upon them publicly as a matters of conclusive “*fact*” – \$10,000;

5. (AM6/WF) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have, as “*officers of the court*” violated or otherwise “*obstructed*” the premise that the “*judicial process*” commands that “*due process*” take place to allow parties and counter-parties “to get all people or materials” together and in one’s own favor - \$10,000;
6. (AM6/PT) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that the “*parties*” as Grievants, Claimants, and Crime Victims must have a public trial prior to having the “*counter-parties*” conclude publicly as matters of “*fact*” that the Grievants, Claimants, and Crime Victims are guilty of being “*vexatious litigants*,” “*frivolous filers*,” “*paper terrorists*,” “*Sovereign Citizens*” (implying “*domestic terrorists*”) or otherwise in criminal “*contempt of court*” or in violation of the laws of any state or the United States – \$10,000;
7. (AM5/IND) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*No person shall be held to answer for any serious crime without a Grand Jury indictment*” (or deprived of access to an “*independent*” Grand Jury for reporting crimes of others, including “*government officials*” acting as “*domestic terrorists*”) – \$10,000;

8. (AM14.1/CUS) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*All persons born or naturalized in the U.S. are to be protected by the U.S. Constitution*” – \$10,000;
9. (AM14.1/EP) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*All persons shall be equally protected and restricted by the law*” (meaning that fiduciary “*government officials*” and members of the “*State BAR*” are not provided favorable treatment or more protections than other everyday Americans) – \$10,000;
- 10.(421/UP, UI) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that (“*We*”) the people of each state (e.g., Michigan) can do anything that is allowed in any other state (without being deprived of our unalienable liberties) – \$10,000;
- 11.(411/ARP) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*no state [or government] shall refuse to acknowledge the actions and records of other states [or governments],*” meaning also that the substantive records properly submitted to this instant *Article III Court of Record* shall not be “*stricken*” or “*dismissed*” procedurally without proper “*litigation of the merits*” of those actions and records – \$10,000;

12.(AM14.1/CP,CI) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*No state shall make or enforce any law [including judge-made “case” law] limiting the rights [and liberties] guaranteed in the U.S. Constitution*” – \$10,000;

13.(OTHER) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have engaged in or otherwise “*aided and abetted*” in the carrying out of felonies, in “*Misprision of Felony,*” in “*Domestic Terrorism,*” in “*Treason,*” and in “*Misprision of Treason,*” which are violations of the public’s rights as much as they are the violations of the rights of the Grievants/Claimants/Crime Victims – \$10,000.

c) GUARANTEES OF REASONABLE ENFORCEMENT OF BASIC RIGHTS –

1. (AM4/PS) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that American nationals are “safe from unwarranted searches and seizures” of their person, and/or of anything that otherwise belongs to them, and/or of anything within the scope of their responsibility – \$10,000;

2. (AM4/WAR,PC) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “***any action***” that they take against Grievants/Claimants/Crime Victims – including the “*striking*” of

substantive documents and/or the “*dismissal*” of their allegations of criminal misconduct and the deprivation of First Amendment rights in “*backward-looking-access-to-court*” claims – “***must be fully described in writing, issued by a court of law***” (i.e., an Article III Court of Record and not an administrative agency or Article I court employing “equity” or “chancery” practices), “***signed by a [competent] judge***” (i.e., not by some 92-year old “*imposter*” to the Article III “*bench*”), “***and sworn on oath***” [i.e., not to imply integrity by simple “*title of nobility*” and by the “*signing*” as “*s/(name)*” after a “Writ of Show Cause” and “Order for Competency Hearing” have been issued by constructively denied by acquiescence to the allegations] – \$10,000;

3. (101/OC) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*no state shall pass any law impairing the obligation of contracts,*” including fiduciary contracts and obligations of “*government officials*” under state and federal laws, and under the U.S. Constitution as the “*Supreme Law of the Land*” – \$10,000;
4. (OTHER) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the Michigan Constitution (Art. 1, § 24) governing the *Rights of Crime Victims*, as well as federal Victims’ Rights laws by failure to protect the alleged crime victims from further damages by “*the*

accused”; and by their instead taking action which otherwise attempts to “*enjoin*” or preclude these crime victims from being able to “*redress*” their “*complaints*” and “*claims of damages*” in any other forum of “*civil*” or “*criminal*” action against “*the accused*” as their alleged perpetrators - \$10,000;

d) GUARANTEES OF DUE PROCESS (ACTION / REACTION PROCESS THAT PROVIDES JUSTICE FOR ALL) –

1. (AM5/DP) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*No person shall be deprived of anything without a fair trial based on Constitutional law*” - \$10,000;
2. (AM14/DP) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*No state*” [i.e., government “actors” employed by the state to include state-regulated BAR attorneys and judges] *shall deprive anyone of anything without a fair trial based on Constitutional law*” - \$10,000;
3. (192/HC) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that American nationals “*have a right to further court process if [they] have been unlawfully confined* (such as by Writ of Habeas Corpus)” in that all of “*the accused*” have participated in the process of “*striking*” and/or “*dismissing*” and “*cover up*” of the

Evidence that David Schied's "*habeas corpus*" filings were denied such due process when properly presented with proof that such acts were properly solicited by agents acting on behalf of Grievant/Claimant David Schied in 2012 when he was unlawfully searched, seized, abducted, and falsely imprisoned as a bona fide "*crime victim*" subjected to "*state created dangers*" by means of these events – \$10,000;

4. (322/SCA) – Each of the above-named "*persons*" as "*the accused*" have violated the premise that Grievants/Claimants/Crime Victims "*have a right to an appeal*" of their case(s) "*to a higher court*" (that is competent or otherwise not corrupted or engaging in racketeering or domestic terrorism behaviors) – \$10,000;

5. (OTHER) – Each of the above-named "*persons*" as "*the accused*" have used the "*color of law*," in concert with others of their peer group of State BAR of Michigan members, to deprive Grievants/Claimants of their rights to due process as American nationals and as reported "*crime victims*," and while also being denied access to the federal special grand juries as otherwise required under 18 U.S.C. § 3332;

e) PROTECTIONS AGAINST UNREASONABLE GOVERNMENT BEHAVIOR (OVER-CONTROLLING THE LIVES OF AMERICANS) –

1. (193/XL) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*No law*” (including judge-made “*case*” law) “*can be passed today that can punish [an American national] for something that s/he did [lawfully] in the past*” – \$10,000;
2. (101/XL) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*No state*” (including a state-regulated attorney or judge as a member of the State BAR) “*shall pass any law today that can punish [an American national] for something s/he did [lawfully] in the past*” – \$10,000;
3. (411/CPE) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*Congress*” [i.e., legislators as representatives of “*the people*” and not “*judicial usurpers*” operating under their own self-determined administrative “*rules*” and “*procedures*”] *determines the effect of state legal processes*” – \$10,000;
4. (AM5/DJ) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*No person shall suffer more than once for the same offense;*” particularly when the labeling of a “*conviction*” creates certain known legal “*disabilities*” without any evidence of “*litigation of the merits*” and when such labels create additional “*state created dangers*” in the process of dismissing appeals and/or allegations of a

wrongful conduct and a First Amendment “*denial of access*” to the courts – \$10,000;

6. (101/LMR) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have acted privately and “*in concert*” with others to “*declare war*” upon Grievants/Claimants/Crime Victims by means of violating Michigan and United States constitutions, the state statutes and federal codes, and even their own state and federal court rules, Judicial Canons, and Codes of Professional Conduct – \$10,000;

7. (AMB/XB) Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*No excessive bail shall be required, but shall be proportional to the crime*” when *aiding and abetting* in the cover-up of the unlawful kidnapping and false imprisonment of the co-Defendants in the “*predicate*” case (i.e., underlying cause of action) in which Grievant/Claimant/Crime Victim David Schied was “*denied bail*” altogether, while also being denied “*appeal*” paperwork of any “*judgment order,*” “*register of actions,*” “*hearing transcripts,*” “*court audio or video records,*” “*police report,*” or anything else that might be required by the courts themselves in conducting a subsequent hearing on “*appeal*” or “*habeas corpus*” as had occurred in the instant case, and as

been entered into the Article III Court of Record by sworn and notarized witness statements – \$10,000;

8. (AMB/XF) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*No excessive fines shall be imposed, but that fines shall be proportional to the crimes*”. This means that acts which are intentionally constructed so as to exhaust funding and efforts of Grievants/Claimants/Crime Victims for their repeatedly bringing “*‘backward-looking’ First Amendment ‘right-to-redress’ cases*” into the courts only to have them repeatedly “*dismissed*” as “*vexatious*” and “*frivolous*” are NOT acts which are reasonably proportional to the “*crimes*” being reported. Thus, they are, in fact, “*excessive*” to those attempting to “*bail*” themselves out the constructive “*trap*” of “*the accused*” Counter-parties/Defendants/Accused who are intentionally depriving the people they have wronged, of their rights to freedom from these illegal bindings lasting a lifetime of un-resolve – \$10,000;
9. (AMB/CP) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*No excessive punishment (torture) shall be inflicted*”. As indicated in the paragraph immediately above, by constructing acts that deny just resolves to Grievants/Claimants/Crime Victims in the courts the Counter-parties/Defendants/Accused are

subjecting these people to a “*lifetime of torture and punishment*” proportional with their perpetual exercise of First Amendment right to “*redress of grievances*” – \$10,000;

10.(AMB/UP) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*No unusual punishment shall be inflicted; and there shall be equal suffering for equal crimes*”. As indicated in the paragraphs above, by constructing a “*justice*” system that provide “*aid and comfort*” to criminals and fellow *domestic terrorists* while punishing whistleblowers and crime victims, Grievants/Claimants/Crime Victims are subjected to cruel and unusual punishment while those committing the crimes are rewarded with “*immunities*” by a self-serving and unequal “*just us*” system – \$10,000;

f) PROTECTIONS AGAINST GOVERNMENT SECRECY – WHICH FORCES GOVERNMENT TO BE HONEST –

1. (AM6/INFO; AM14.1/EP) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that Grievants/Claimants/Crime Victims shall require as much from their adversaries operating unlawfully as “*domestic terrorists*” to *coerce* government policies and practices, as such require from Grievants and Claimants, as their Crime Victims – \$10,000;

2. (311/GB) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*all judges may only hold their office(s) during good behavior*” by their endorsement and promotion of *judicial usurpers* as the instrumental tools for their effectiveness as *domestic terrorists* – \$10,000;
3. (AM5/JC) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*no one shall give up or lose anything [i.e., jury fees or taxes paid for “honest” government services] for public gain without fair compensation*” (such as when cases like the instant one are “*dismissed*” in summary fashion without jury trial of the facts, by a crime syndicate of imposters posing conducting “*dishonest*” government services) – \$10,000;
4. (AM7/JT) – As additionally implied by the paragraph immediately above, each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*all trials involving the threat of jail, and involving over \$20 shall be tried by jury*” – \$10,000;
5. (AM6/ST, PT) – As implied by more than one of the paragraphs, by constructing a system that punishes the whistleblowers and crime victims while providing safe harbor, aid, and comfort to domestic terrorists, the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have repeatedly

violated the premise that “*all trials involving the threat of jail shall be speedy and public*” – \$10,000;

6. (323/JT) – As implied by more than one of the paragraphs, by constructing a system that punishes the whistleblowers and crime victims while providing safe harbor, aid, and comfort to domestic terrorists, the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have repeatedly violated the premise that “*all trials involving the threat of jail shall be by jury*” – \$10,000;
7. (323/TIS) – As also implied by more than one of the paragraphs, by constructing a system that punishes the whistleblowers and crime victims while providing safe harbor, aid, and comfort to domestic terrorists, the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have repeatedly violated the premise that “*trial(s) must be in the state where the crime(s) was/were committed*” – \$10,000;
8. (AM6/IJT) – As implied by more than one of the paragraphs, by constructing a system that punishes the whistleblowers and crime victims while providing safe harbor, aid, and comfort to domestic terrorists, the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have repeatedly violated the premise that “*a jury must impartially rule on facts (even*

when ruling against any law – including any judge-made law – that they believe is unfair” – \$10,000;

9. (AM6/TWC) – As implied by more than one of the paragraphs, by constructing a system that punishes the whistleblowers and crime victims while providing safe harbor, aid, and comfort to domestic terrorists, the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have repeatedly violated the premise that “*a jury must be of the state and district where the crime(s) was/were committed*” – \$10,000;
- 10.(AM6/DPA) – As implied by more than one of the paragraphs, by constructing a system that punishes the whistleblowers and crime victims while providing safe harbor, aid, and comfort to domestic terrorists, the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have repeatedly violated the premise that “*the trial district must be pre-established by law to insure a fair sampling of people in the jury*” – \$10,000;
- 11.(101/TN) – As implied by more than one of the paragraphs, by constructing a system that punishes the whistleblowers and crime victims while providing safe harbor, aid, and comfort to domestic terrorists, the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have repeatedly violated the premise that “*no state shall set anyone (including BAR*

Association members, “*Esquires*” or “*judges*” or “*justices*” or other titles of nobility, etc.) *above the Common Man*” – \$10,000;

12.(101/TAC) – As implied by more than one of the paragraphs, by constructing a system that punishes the whistleblowers and crime victims while providing safe harbor, aid, and comfort to domestic terrorists, the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have repeatedly violated the premise that “*no state shall work against the U.S. Constitution with anyone*” (including BAR Associations, etc.) – \$10,000;

13.(431/NNS) – As implied by more than one of the paragraphs, by constructing a system that punishes the whistleblowers and crime victims while providing safe harbor, aid, and comfort to domestic terrorists, the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have repeatedly violated the premise that “*no controlling agency (including BAR Associations, etc.) shall be formed (or act) in violation of the U.S. Constitution*” – \$10,000;

14.(331/TAU) – As implied by more than one of the paragraphs, by constructing a system that punishes the whistleblowers and crime victims while providing safe harbor, aid, and comfort to domestic terrorists, the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have repeatedly

violated the premise that “*no controlling agency shall harass a U.S. Citizen (i.e., mixing the ‘levying of war’ with ‘treason’)*” – \$10,000;

15.(111/SP) – As implied by more than one of the paragraphs, each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have repeatedly violated the premise that “*only Congress has the power to make laws*” when they rely upon “*judge-made*” procedural rules or “*case*” law to “*strike*” substantive filings and to “*dismiss*” cases summarily rather than upon the Supreme Law of the Land (i.e., the U.S. Constitution) and state and federal legislation to “*litigate the merits*” of civil cases and criminal allegations set forth as formal “*complaints*” – \$10,000;

16.(311/SP) – As implied by more than one of the paragraphs, each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have repeatedly violated the premise that “*only impartial courts, judges, and juries can decide punishments and rewards with regard to the parties and the laws*” – \$10,000;

g) PROTECTING AGAINST GOVERNMENT COMPLETELY

CONTROLLING THE LIVES OF AMERICANS (DOMINATION) –

1. (AM5/WAH) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*,” when discrediting, misinterpreting, misrepresenting, and/or otherwise blatantly ignoring the statements of whistleblowers and crime victims

- while arguing in favor of “*contempt of court*” charges or “*sanctions*” against these “*truths*” being stated (sometimes repeatedly), have violated the premise that “*no person shall be forced to say or do anything that can be used against him later (for any reason)*” – \$10,000;
2. (193/BA) – As implied by more than one of the above-paragraphs, each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*no person or group can made a law, judge on it, AND punish under it*” (i.e. such as has been documented in this instant case whereby the judiciary disregards substantive state and federal legislation while using – *under color of law* – the “*Federal Rules of Procedure*” to “*strike*” substantive filings and to “*dismiss*” the entirety of the case with an accompanying implied threat that should Grievant/Claimant/PAG/ Crime Victim David Schied make another filing in the “*District Court*” that he will be “*punished*” with yet another unlawful so-called “*conviction*” of “*contempt of court*”) – \$10,000;
 3. (101/BA) – As also implied by the paragraph immediately above, each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have violated the premise that “*no state shall allow any person or group to make a law, judge on it, AND punish under it*” – \$10,000;

4. (OTHER) – As provided by the plethora of Evidence, by defending the actions of the *co-Defendants* in the instant “*predicate*” case while upholding the resulting unfounded “*conviction*” obtained by fraud and actions which otherwise “*shocked the conscience*” of witnesses to the “*kidnapping*” and “*false incarceration*” of David Schied, each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have constructed a fraudulent “*Bill of Pains and Penalties*” (a.k.a., “*Bill of Attainder*” effectively working “*corruption of blood*” by denying Grievant/Claimant/Crime Victim David Schied the ability to support his family and provide anything for their inheritance) – \$10,000;

h) GUARANTEES THAT IF SOMETHING IS WRONG, YOUR GOVERNMENT MUST DO SOMETHING:

1. (AM14.1/CUS) Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*all persons born or naturalized in the U.S. are to be protected by the U.S. Constitution*” – \$10,000;
2. (AM14.4 PDO) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*expenditures of taxes spent (and the creation of public debt) for unlawful purposes may be questioned*” by

redress, and that the payment of tax dollars should not be used to support *domestic terrorists* operating in and around the public courthouses—
\$10,000;

3. (197/NUW) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*no money may be withdrawn from the Public Treasury for unlawful purposes*” – \$10,000;
4. (AM16/TX) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*Congress has the power to lay and collect taxes only for lawful purposes*” and that payment tax dollars should not be used to support *domestic terrorists* operating in and around the public courthouses – \$10,000;
5. (AM5/JC) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*no one shall give up or lose anything (i.e., whether taxes or jury fees) for public gain without fair compensation*” – \$10,000;
6. (AM1/PA, RG) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*”

have violated the premise that Grievants/Claimants/Crime Victims “*may assemble peaceably with others to ask the Government to protect their rights*” – \$10,000;

7. (AM9/ER) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*all rights belong to the people, some being explicitly stated, and some being not (stated)*” – \$10,000;
8. (AM10/PR) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*all government power comes from the consent of the people governed*” – \$10,000;
9. (AM5/DP) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*no person shall be deprived of anything without a fair trial based on Constitutional law*” – \$10,000;
- 10.(AM14/DP) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*no state shall deprive anyone of anything without a fair trial based on Constitutional law*” – \$10,000;

11. (441/GRG) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*the U.S. guarantees a system of laws to protect the majority AND minority*” – \$10,000;
- 12.(612/SL) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*This Constitution is the Supreme Law of the Land*” – \$10,000;
- 13.(613/BO) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*all law makers, court officials, and enforcement officers are bound oath to the U.S. Constitution*” – \$10,000;
- 14.(612/JB) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*all judges are bound by oath to support the United States Constitution*” – \$10,000;
- 15.(441/PAI) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*the U.S. will protect every U.S. Citizen against any attack upon themselves or their rights*” – \$10,000;

16.(441/PADV) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*the U.S. will protect every U.S. Citizen against local attack upon themselves or their rights*” – \$10,000;

17.(AM14.3/HO,IR) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*no person shall hold office if he rebels against or violates the U.S. Constitution (e.g., by way of treason)*” – \$10,000;

i) GUARANTEES THAT IF SOMETHING IS WRONG, WHAT THE GOVERNMENT IS REQUIRED TO DO:

1. (241/IMP) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” having affirmatively failed to properly act upon unrebutted sworn, notarized Statements and irrefutable Evidence, have violated the premise that “*any government employee (except Army and Navy) may be impeached*” – \$10,000;

2. (136/STI) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” having affirmatively failed to properly act upon unrebutted sworn, notarized Statements and irrefutable Evidence pertaining to corrupt state and federal judges, and pertaining to their fraudulent “*judgments,*”

“*memorandums,*” “*orders,*” “*opinions,*” and other such “*rulings,*” and by failing to self-regulate, self-monitor, and self-report these crimes to the Senate Judiciary Committee of the Senate, have violated the premise that “*only the Senate shall try impeachments*” – \$10,000;

3. (136/SCI) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” having affirmatively failed to properly act upon unrebutted sworn, notarized Statements and irrefutable Evidence pertaining to corrupt state and federal judges, and pertaining to their fraudulent “*judgments,*” “*memorandums,*” “*orders,*” “*opinions,*” and other such “*rulings,*” and by failing to self-regulate, self-monitor, and self-report these crimes to the Senate Judiciary Committee of the Senate, have violated the premise that “*only the Senate shall convict in cases of impeachments*” – \$10,000;
4. (137/JI) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” having affirmatively failed to properly act upon unrebutted sworn, notarized Statements and irrefutable Evidence pertaining to corrupt state and federal judges, and by failing to self-regulate, self-monitor, and self-report these crimes to the Senate Judiciary Committee of the Senate, have violated the premise that “*the impeachment bars one from office*” – \$10,000;

5. (137/LSL) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” having affirmatively failed to properly act upon un rebutted sworn, notarized Statements and irrefutable Evidence pertaining to corrupt state and federal judges, and by failing to self-regulate, self-monitor, and self-report these crimes to the Senate Judiciary Committee of the Senate, have violated the premise that “*the impeachment shall be subject to trial and punishment like anyone else*” – \$10,000;
6. (331/TC) – (137/JI) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” having affirmatively failed to properly act upon un rebutted sworn, notarized Statements and irrefutable Evidence pertaining to corrupt state and federal judges, and by failing to self-regulate, self-monitor, and self-report these crimes, have violated the premise that “*it takes at least two witnesses or a confession in court to convict anyone of treason*” – \$10,000;
7. (332/TP) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” having affirmatively failed to properly act upon un rebutted sworn, notarized Statements and irrefutable Evidence pertaining to corrupt state and federal judges, and by failing to self-regulate, self-monitor, and self-report these crimes to the Senate Judiciary Committee of the Senate,

have violated the premise that “*Congress shall decide the punishment for treason*” – \$10,000;

8. (AM14.3/RD) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” having affirmatively failed to properly act upon unrebutted sworn, notarized Statements and irrefutable Evidence pertaining to corrupt state and federal judges, and by failing to self-regulate, self-monitor, and self-report these crimes to the Senate Judiciary Committee of the Senate, have violated the premise that “*Congress shall impeach anyone who rebels against or violates the U.S. Constitution*” – \$10,000;
9. Other – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “Congress has legislated against domestic terrorism (i.e., see 18 U.S.C. § 2331 and 31 CFR § 594.311) – \$10,000;
10. Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” have affirmatively failed to properly identify and invalidate either the outright fraudulent “Report and Recommendation” of the so-called administrative “*magistrate*” Stephanie Davis and/or the outright fraudulent “Memorandum and Order” that was supposedly “*signed*” by the so-called federal “*judge*” Avern Cohn or the outright fraudulent “Judgment of Dismissal” that was digitally signed by Marie Verlinde for David

Weaver and for herself. Nevertheless, any one of these named “*accused*” had the power and authority to judge the outrageous level of fraud being perpetrated upon the Court by these filings; and thus to properly issue a “*report*” or other court filing that would assert what is otherwise provided by American Jurisprudence (AM JUR 2D) §§256 and/or 257 of which AM JUR 2D § 256 provides as follows:

“The general misconception is that any statute passed by legislators bearing the appearance of law constitutes the law of the land. The U.S. Constitution is the supreme law of the land, and any statute, to be valid, must be In agreement. It is impossible for both the Constitution and a law violating it to be valid; one must prevail. This is succinctly stated as follows: The General rule is that an unconstitutional statute, though having the form and name of law is in reality no law, but is wholly void, and ineffective for any purpose; since unconstitutionality dates from the time of its enactment and not merely from the date of the decision so branding it. An unconstitutional law, in legal contemplation, is as inoperative as if it had never been passed. Such a statute leaves the question that it purports to settle just as it would be had the statute not been enacted. Since an unconstitutional law is void, the general principles follow that it imposes no duties, confers no rights, creates no office, bestows no power or authority on anyone, affords no protection, and justifies no acts performed under it..... A void act cannot be legally consistent with a valid one. An unconstitutional law cannot operate to supersede any existing valid law. Indeed, insofar as a statute runs counter to the fundamental law of the land, it is superseded thereby. No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce it.”

11.(321/JUC) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*the Court’s power reaches into all cases involving the U.S. Constitution or any laws made under it;*” or, in

otherwise recognizing those powers, took such action as to abuse those powers as “*domestic terrorists*” with the deliberate intent to coerce government *policy and practice* and to coerce the civilian population affected by those policies and practices – \$10,000;

12.(321/JUP) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*the Court’s power shall extend to any case involving the United States as a party;*” or, in otherwise recognizing that Grievants/Claimants/PAGs David Schied’s and Cornell Squires’ numerous filings – inclusive of unrebutted sworn and notarized “*joinder*” Affidavits implicating others in the peer group of “*the accused*” (i.e., other fellow members of the State BAR of Michigan) for previous crimes of Treason, took such action as to abuse those powers as “*domestic terrorists*” with the deliberate intent to “*aid and abet,*” to criminally “*cover-up,*” and to act as “*domestic terrorists*” to coerce government *policy and practice* and to coerce the civilian population affected by deliberately suppress and/or to extinguish altogether those constitutionally guaranteed policies and practices – \$10,000;

13. Under the light of all the above, as well as with clear knowledge of 18 U.S.C §§ 241-242, each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*”

and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “the Court shall punish according” these federal codes – \$10,000;

j) PUNISHMENTS PROVIDED FOR CORRUPT PEOPLE IN OFFICE, WHO ARE DRAWING PUBLIC FUNDS –

1. (311/CS) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*judges will be paid for their services, but not for their disservices*” – \$10,000;
2. (AM14.4/OC, IR) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*the United States shall not be bound to finance its own destruction*” – \$10,000;
3. (AM14.4/OC,V) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*the debt incurred by the U.S. to finance its own destruction is VOID*” – \$10,000;
4. (101/OC) – Each of the above-named “*persons*” as “*the accused*” and being employed in government as fiduciary “*officers of the court*” have violated the premise that “*no State shall pass any law (including ‘judge-*

made' law) *impairing the obligations of contracts,*" including the fiduciary obligations that are contracted by each public official upon the subscribing to their respective Oaths of office in contract with the People of the state and the United States for "*faithful performance*" of their respective fiduciary "*duties of office*" – \$10,000;

5. (OTHER) Under the light of all the above, as well as with clear knowledge of what is implied by the levying of criminal allegations such as "*misprision of felony*" and "*misprision of treason*", Each of the above-named "*persons*" as "*the accused*" and being employed in government as fiduciary "*officers of the court*" have violated the premise that the Court shall – at minimum – report certain crimes to the appropriate jurisdiction and punish those (such as "*fraud*") for which the Court already has such jurisdiction – \$10,000.

ARGUMENT JUSTIFYING THIS "WRIT OF ERROR CORAM NOBIS,"
"ORDER OF CONTEMPT," AND "LEDGER OF DAMAGES"

In the United States, *coram nobis* is the name generally employed to the court which tried the cause. See *Tweed v. Lockton*, 35 Del. 474, 167 A. 703, 705 (1932); *Ballentine's Law Dictionary*, Coram Vobis, p1373. "*Coram nobis is Issued by the court in which the judgment assailed was rendered; while the writ of coram nobis is issued by a supervening court to a lower court in which the judgment was*

rendered." Roughton v. Brown, 53 N.C. 393 (1861). See also Teller v. Wetherell, 6 Mich. 45 (1858).²¹

The “writ of error *coram nobis*” is strictly a common law writ and does not issue out of a court of chancery. Reid v. Strider, 7 Gratt. 76 (Va. 1850)-(or 48 Va. 39). Hence, this Writ comes from the “*officers*” of this instant Article III Court of Record, operating in the public’s interest as Private Attorney Generals, to members of the State BAR of Michigan effectively functioning as an organized crime syndicate, for which there is ample evidence that it is operating under “*fraud*” and criminally under “*color of law*” as the “*United States District Court*.”

Most courts, which today recognize the writ, require a sworn affidavit showing to a reasonable certainty error of fact resulting in the erroneous decision. In this case there is a record of over 60 “*sworn affidavits*” and/or sworn “*Criminal Complaints*” being submitted to this Article III Court of Record BEFORE the judgment was made; therefore there is much more than mere “*reasonable*” certainty that “*error of facts*” exists in the court record. There is, in fact, reasonable certainty that the “*officers*” of the United States District Court have been acting in

²¹ The legal sufficiency of the evidence to justify setting aside a judgment, on writ of *coram nobis*, is a question of law on which the trial court's finding is not binding on the appellate court, which, in effect means that where no appeal has been had from the original hearing, the writ should address the actions of the trial court and in case of an adverse ruling, an appeal may be had to an appellate court for a review of the legal sufficiency of the grounds upon which the writ was based. (See State v. Hudspeth, 191 Ark. 963, 88 S.W.2d 858 (1935); Partlow v. Indiana, 194 Ind. 172, 141 N.E. 513, 30 A.L.R. 1414 (1923).

Treason and a *Conspiracy to Treason* as “domestic terrorists” to deprive litigants of their rightful claims to justice as otherwise constitutionally guaranteed by the First Amendment by “access to the court” for meaningful “redress of grievances.”

The purpose of this writ is not to authorize a court to review its opinion, but only to vacate some adjudication made. *Madden v. Ferguson*, 182 Ill.App. 210 (1913).

In this case, the written “*rulings*” of the federal District Court fraudulently claims that Grievant/Claimant David Schied has a “*conviction*” without consideration for the FACTS that explain the fraudulent basis and lack of jurisdiction by which such a determination was derived (either by co-Defendant Karen Khalil as an alleged “*judicial usurper*” or by the 92-year old federal “*judge*” Avern Cohn after ignoring two writs for “*show cause*” and an “*Order for Competency Hearing*”). As such, David Schied – as well as all of the other Grievants/Claimants entering into this case in “*mass joinder*” – have a right to clear their names (as well as to other just remedies as founded in the maxims of Common Law).

Additionally, the “*Memorandum and Order*” issued by Avern Cohn and the “*Judgment of Dismissal*” issued by the clerks David Weaver and Marie Velinde were issued AFTER the “*PAGs Schied’s and Squires’ Order of Default Judgment*’ on Numerous Unrebutted Criminal Allegations Against DOES #1

Through #4 and... 'Conspiracy to Fraud Upon the Court' by Magistrate Stephanie Davis...and PAGs Schied's and Squires' 'Denial of Any Proposed 'Substitution' of Defendant 'DOE' Charles 'No Appearance' Browning...and PAGs Schied's and Squires 'Objection to 'Criminally Accused' Stephanie Davis' 'Report and Recommendation' Sua Sponte Dismissal and Termination of All (9) Pending Motions'” which have, as is the *pattern and practice*, been summarily “dismissed” without proper acceptance or prior *litigation of the merits* of the underlying basis for that any many other substantive filings of this case.

In short, the clear Evidence shows that for the past 16 months public taxpayers have been paying for a sham operation of domestic terrorists passing themselves off as a legitimate federal “*court*” and, as Private Attorney Generals looking out for the public’s interests as well as the interests of the “*joinder*” Grievants/Claimants who have ALL FILED AFFIDAVITS in this case, there is just cause for this instant “*Writ of Error Coram Nobis.*”

Moreover, the same batch of Evidence supports the basis for the claims under the Laws of Commerce, as issued against the “*judge*”, the two “*magistrates*”, the two “*clerk(s) of the court*”, against all the named “*attorneys*” operating individually and severally along with the others as all being common representative members of the same “*State BAR of Michigan,*” against the “District Court” itself, and against the UNITED STATES, which thus far has done nothing

in response to sworn Affidavits and Criminal Complaint being filed with the U.S. Attorney General as the Department of Justice head for the UNITED STATES.

CONCLUSION IN ‘DENIAL’ AND ‘ORDER’ OF RELIEF

By reason of the above submitted UNREBUTTED (except in summary fashion by blatant fraud) FACTS, STATEMENTS, and ARGUMENTS submitted to this Article III Court of Record in accordance with common sense and Common Law, the following is herein ORDERED:

- 1) The above-named “*officers of the court*” being found in “*contempt of court*,” are to be immediately arrested by the UNITED STATES Attorney General Loretta Lynch and her “*agents*” of the Department of Justice; and thereafter to be subjected to criminal proceedings as based upon the sworn FACTS and EVIDENCE levied against each of them as found in the numerous “Sworn and Notarized Affidavits” and sworn “*Criminal Complaints*” found in this instant Article III Court of Record;
- 2) All personal bonds, performance bonds, blanket bonds, blanket insurance, “*errors and omissions*” insurance, and/or “*terrorism*” insurance are to be immediately surrendered and made public for EACH of the individuals named by the Criminal Complaint (“**Exhibit #17**”) to include Avern Cohn, Michael Hluchaniuk, Stephanie Davis, David Weaver, Marie Velinde, James Mellon, John Clark, Jeffrey Clark, Charles Browning, Warren White, Zenna Elhasan,

Davidde Stella, the State BAR of Michigan, the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, and the UNITED STATES.

- 3) The instant case is to be reinstated and litigated on the merits in Common Law and in accordance with the Jury Demand initially issued when this case was filed in May of 2015, with *litigation of the merits* beginning with the legitimacy of the documents “*stricken*” in September 2015 by Michael Hluchaniuk, which were subsequently “*replaced*” as rewritten and resubmitted in October 2015 and have remained “pending” ever since;
- 4) The UNITED STATES Senate is hereby ORDERED to put Avern Cohn on an “*impeachment trial*” for his *malfeasance* of fiduciary responsibilities and for Treason;
- 5) The UNITED STATES judiciary, as the “*Third Branch*” of U.S. Government, shall appoint an alternate Article III judge with “*lifetime employment*” to this instant case and to preside in accordance with the U.S. Constitution as the “*Supreme Law of the Land*”;
- 6) As a proximate cause of the itemized damages incurred against PAGs/Grievants and the other “*joinders*” litigants in this matter, and as referenced in prior filings, EACH of the above named individuals, along with their clients – all acting in their private capacities to be “*aiding and abetting*” in ongoing “*secondary-level*” crimes, and as “*accessories after the fact*” in covering up the

tortuous common law and statutory “*predicate*” crimes as has been repeatedly reported – are ORDERED to being assessed, charged with, and Ordered to Pay the following in accordance with the “*Ledger of ‘Counts’ in Commerce Depicting Debts Owed...*”:

- a) EACH is Ordered to pay the “*original*” **\$150 MILLION** claimed by the “*original*” filing of this case;
- b) EACH is Ordered to pay the **\$30 MILLION** for participating in a “*Financial Crimes Enterprise*” by their “*Frauds and Swindles*” upon the Grievants/Claimants and upon the Public at Large;
- c) EACH is Ordered to pay the **\$30 MILLION** as statutory fines for the listed FELONY offenses;
- d) EACH is Ordered to pay the **\$12.6 MILLION** (“\$12,600,000”) for their itemized infractions against the U.S. Constitution.



Respectively,

Dated: 10/3/16

Cornell Squires, Grievant/Claimant/Private Attorney General
(all rights reserved)