

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

David Schied and Cornell Squires,  
acting in the capacity of Private Attorney  
Generals (“PAGs”) *State Ex Rel*, and on  
behalf of *Sui Juris Grievants/Claimants and  
Crime Victims David Schied, Cornell Squires,  
and other people* <sup>1</sup> *similarly situated*

Sixth Circuit COA Case No. 15-2464  
Lower Court Case  
No. 2:15-cv-11840  
District Court of the United States 2  
for the Eastern District of Michigan

v.  
Karen Khalil, et al

*Defendants* /

**PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERALS (“PAGs”) DAVID SCHIED’S AND  
CORNELL SQUIRES’ COMMON LAW “ORDER FOR EN BANC REVIEW AND  
ANSWER IN REPORT ON ‘QUO WARRANTO’”  
PREVIOUSLY FILED INTO THE SIXTH CIRCUIT ON 1/12/16  
(as COA DOCKET ITEM #22)  
ALONG WITH 174 “INTEMIZED EXHIBITS”  
WHICH CONTAINED THOUSANDS OF PAGES OF “EVIDENCE OF  
‘DOMESTIC TERRORISM’”;**  
**YET HAS ALTOGETHER REMAINED UNANSWERED FOR ONE YEAR BY  
THE 6<sup>TH</sup> CIRCUIT COURT, BY MEANS OF RELEGATING SUCH FILING TO  
“TENDERED” STATUS AND PENDING “REVIEW” BY THE SAME “CLERK”  
AGAINST WHOM A “WRIT OF ERROR” AND ACCOMPANYING  
“MANDAMUS FOR BOND SURRENDER” (COA DKT. #20)  
HAD BEEN ISSUED ON 12/28/15 BY PAG DAVID SCHIED, IN A CASE FOR  
WHICH CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS REMAIN PENDING AGAINST  
FIFTEEN (15) “AGENTS” OF THE UNITED STATES AND ITS “DISTRICT  
COURT, ET AL”; AND AGAINST WHICH A “DEFAULT JUDGMENT” AND A  
\$230 MILLION CLAIM “IN COMMERCE” HAS BEEN WELL-ESTABLISHED  
AND IS NOW “IN COLLECTIONS”**

This “ex parte” action is being brought by:  
*Sui Juris Grievants/Claimants in Commerce / Crime Victims  
Next Friends and Co-Private Attorney Generals  
David Schied and Cornell Squires*  
P.O. Box 1378  
Novi, Michigan 48376  
248-974-7703 (all calls are recorded)

David Schied and Cornell Squires (hereinafter “PAGs *Schied and Squires*”), being each **of the People**, and having established this case as a *suit of the sovereign*, acting in their own capacity, herein accept for value the oaths<sup>3</sup> and bonds of all the officers of this court including judges, clerks, and attorneys.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.*”

<sup>2</sup> “The term 'District Courts of the United States,' as used in the rules, without an addition expressing a wider connotation, has its historic significance. It describes the constitutional courts created under article 3 of the Constitution. Courts of the Territories are legislative courts, properly speaking, and are not District Courts of the United States. We have often held that vesting a territorial court with jurisdiction similar to that vested in the District Courts of the United States does not make it a 'District Court of the United States.” *Mookini v. United States*, 303 U.S. 201 (1938) citing from *Reynolds v. United States*, 98 U.S. 145 , 154; *The City of Panama*, 101 U.S. 453 , 460; *In re Mills*, 135 U.S. 263, 268 , 10 S.Ct. 762; *McAllister v. United States*, 141 U.S. 174, 182 , 183 S., 11 S.Ct. 949; *Stephens v. Cherokee Nation*, 174 U.S. 445, 476 , 477 S., 19 S.Ct. 722; *Summers v. United States*, 231 U.S. 92, 101 , 102 S., 34 S.Ct. 38; *United States v. Burroughs*, 289 U.S. 159, 163 , 53 S. Ct. 574.

Having already presented the initial causes of action to this Article III United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit as a *court of record*,<sup>4</sup> *PAG Schied* and *PAG Squires* hereby proceed according to the course of Common Law.<sup>5</sup>

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**

---

<sup>3</sup> 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 of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution.*"

<sup>4</sup> "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].

<sup>5</sup> 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.]

**“summons” were issued with notice to all co-Defendants that Grievant David Schied is “sui juris.”**

**WE HAVE NEVER CONSENTED** to the assignment of the lower District Court case, which was originally sought to be “*filed*” in Ann Arbor and was alternatively filed in Flint, where all initiating case documents were subsequently sent to Detroit – where important case documents were **STOLEN** and/or **FRAUDULENTLY** modified and/or replaced by the Clerk of the Court David Weaver.

This case documents the who, what, where, when, how, why and under-what-circumstances many other criminal events have occurred in the heart of Wayne County, in a building believed to be leased by Defendant Charter County of Wayne to the “*United States District Court,*” an entity of the UNITED STATES having a proven proclivity toward contributing to the *domestic terrorism* being carried out, hand-in-hand, with *imposters* posing as state and county “*officers of the court*” and other public functionaries. These crimes have been memorialized by PAGs Schied and Squires as a criminal enterprise, with “*patterns and practices*” being carried out for over two decades, being all done as commonly executed “*in concert*” by members of the racketeering organizations and crime syndicates of the State BAR of Michigan with the *treasonous* supervision of Michigan Supreme Court and its various *agents*, all operating as usurpers of *The People’s* power and authority.

## CONCISE STATEMENTS OF THE ISSUES PRESENTED

In the context of the so-called “*Clerk of the Court*” for the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals having “*sidelined*” – or indefinitely rendered into suspended animation by unlawful acts committed *under color of law* for the purpose of depriving Grievants/Claimants in this case of their First Amendment “*meaningful access to the court*” and “*right to redress*” – a plethora of Evidence presented by PAG David Schied to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals a full year ago, supporting allegations about years of criminal corruption, racketeering, and domestic terrorism taking place in and around the so-called “*United States District Court*” in the Eastern District of Michigan, the *agents* of the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court have been tortuously neglecting and relegating that “Quo Warranto” filing to a “*tendered*” status for that full year.

That “Quo Warrant” filing was submitted in the aftermath of PAG David Schied having filed a “Writ of Mandamus for Interlocutory Appeal” along with a “Memorandum of Law’ in Support...” addressing the *pattern and practice* of State BAR of Michigan members, as judges and attorneys, unconstitutionally using rules of *procedure* and irrelevant/misapplied case law to “*strike*” and “*dismiss*” substantive criminal allegations and civil claims of damages in violation of the Rules Enabling Act (of 1934) and the Rules of Decision Act (of 1948) while undermining constitutionally-mandated Separation of Powers; and while executing such actions by various forms of criminal fraud and multi-tiered violations of the RICO Act.

That “Quo Warranto” was submitted also in the aftermath of PAG David Schied reporting crimes of documented theft and prejudicial treatment of the case by the lower (“*District*”) court clerk, as well as PAG Schied furnishing an extensive history, supported by evidence, of *fraud upon the court*. Additionally, that Quo Warranto filing in January 2016 followed PAG Schied’s notice of error about the Sixth Circuit Court Clerk’s own electronic filing method, while referencing the appellate court rules in demand of the bond of the Clerk of the Court, which today still remains unanswered.

That “Quo Warranto” was relegated by the Clerk and/or other Sixth Circuit Court administrators to a status of “Tendered”, while the Sixth Circuit Court “*tribunal*” immediately dismissed the “*Interlocutory Appeal*” without address of the merits, thus allowing the *agents* of the lower “*District Court*” to proceed in committing additional crimes of fraud, and to take such action to “*summarily dismiss*” that 14-month long battle without litigation of the merits.

Prior to the disposal of that case by a 92-year old “*judge*” that never took any prior action in the case except to assign magistrates, at the “*report and recommendation*” of a *second* magistrate that PAGs David Schied and Cornell Squires had objected to entering the case to begin with (to ward off conditions such had occurred by the preceding magistrate which led to “*five replacement filings*” that WERE NEVER LITIGATED and led to the *Interlocutory Appeal* being filed in the first place), and had filed eleven (11) formal “*Criminal Complaints*” along with at least fifty (50) formally sworn Affidavits in testimony of crimes being committed by the *domestic terrorists* posing as government fiduciaries operating in the Eastern District of Michigan.

In response to the criminal acts of the lower court “*actors*” as all being members of the same State BAR of Michigan, PAGs Schied and Squires also filed a “*Writ of Error Corbum Nobis*” with the lower so-called “*court*” rather than to take these unlawful activities “*on appeal*” to the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court. Accompanying that “*Writ of Error Corbum Nobis*” was a “*Ledger*” placing formally into Commerce the claims upon each of the alleged criminals, against the United States District Court, and against the UNITED STATES, totaling \$230 MILLION, which is now in a “*collection*” status.

PAGs David Schied and Cornell Squires herein memorialize these events as occurring just prior to the precise time in which a national “*coup*” has been announced involving the unlawful activities of Hillary Clinton and Anthony Weiner and their connections with domestic and international terrorism, with Huma Abadin and her links to other radical Muslims, the funding of *domestic terrorism* by the Clinton Foundation and its affiliates, and international sex trafficking. In current opposition and “*counter-coup*” are whistle-blowing members of U.S. Intelligence and Homeland Security, James Comey and *fed-up* agents of the FBI, the New York Police Department, and patriotic nationalists across America. These activities altogether bring credence and credibility to the long-time claims of PAGs David Schied and Cornell Squires that the entire judicial “*system*” in Michigan is corrupted from “*top-to-bottom*,” and that the *racketeers* and *domestic terrorists* occupy even the highest positions of what is otherwise supposed to be operating under the state and federal constitutions as the Michigan and United States “*judiciaries*.”

PAGs David Schied and Cornell Squires assert that NO “*APPEAL*” CAN BE MADE to the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court about the actions of the lower court until the *Quo Warrant* submitted nearly a year ago is finally *answered*. Therefore, this “*Order for En Banc Review and Answer in Report on ‘Quo Warranto’*” is required, not optional.

## JURISDICTION

The jurisdictional basis of the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals for “*hearing*” a common law “ORDER FOR EN BANC REVIEW AND ANSWER IN REPORT ON QUO WARRANTO” that has been gross negligently ignored and held in some form of “*suspended animation*” and without address for this past full years while given a designation of “*tendered*” is Rule 35 and Rule 40 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

A careful search of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedures (“F.R.A.P.”), the Internal Operating Procedures (“I.O.P.”) and the Local Rules (“L.R.”) located online at <http://www.ca6.uscourts.gov/rules-and-procedures> show there is no reference whatsoever to “*tender*” or any derivative of that word, referencing an action for which a “*hearing*” was never conducted in the first place. Meanwhile, Rule 35 maintains that the conditions warranting “*rehearing en blanc*” are twofold: 1) “*to secure or maintain uniformity of the court’s decisions;*” or, 2) “*when there is a question of exceptional importance.*”

Grievants/Claimants/Crime Victims/PAGs David Schied and Cornell Squires assert herein that the previously-submitted “Quo Warranto” qualifies for “*en blanc hearing*” on both of the above-referenced conditions, being that the documents provided in Evidence of the pending and/or “*tendered*” Quo Warranto reflects of Evidence of a “*precedent-setting error of exceptional public*

*importance*” (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. I.O.P. 35) as these issues involve evidence of a “*pattern and practice*” of Sixth Circuit COA “*judges*” fostering, protecting, and *criminally aiding and abetting domestic terrorists*, , as fellow “*BAR-members*,” who are operating “*courts*” unconstitutionally, in *criminal* violation of their fiduciary Oaths, throughout the federal districts of the Sixth Circuit, as one or more multi-tiered and widespread crime syndicate(s) not unlike the one exposed nationwide in late 2016 as affiliated with the Clintons and those surrounding the Clintons and the Clinton Foundation.

Similarly, because there is no federal or state “*court rule*” which addresses the constructive fraud of either the *clerk* or the *case manager* in placing a substantive filing such as a “*Quo Warranto*” into a “*tendered*” status for a year while refusing to address the demand for performance bonding and/or ‘*errors and omissions*’ insurance policies and/or ‘*terrorism*’ insurance coverage placed against such “*clerk*” or “*case manager*,” there is thus, no rigid guideline as articulated under F.R.A.P. 40 for a logical “*time to file*” or pertaining to the necessity for the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA to “*request*” a “*petition*” or to “*grant*” such a petition. What is applicable from F.R.A.P. 40 is the compelling “*all active judges*” of the bench of the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA to “*issue an appropriate Order*”. (“*Appropriate*,” according to the Oxford and other online dictionaries, is defined as “*suitable under the circumstances*,” which are outlined herein).



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Factual basis for this “ <u>Order for En Banc Review and Answer in Report on ‘Quo Warranto’ Demand</u> ” .....	3
Basis for filing the “ <u>Interlocutory Appeal</u> ” on 11/18/15.....	9
 <b><u>QUESTION #1</u></b> –	
“Does a federal District Court judge’s (or magistrate’s) failure to observe state laws and state court rules governing the judicial obligation to investigate one litigant’s (Grievant Schied’s) criminal ‘ <i>complaint</i> ’ – and the selective application instead of ‘ <i>local court rules</i> ’ against that same litigant in response to a fellow State BAR of Michigan member’s ‘ <i>motion</i> ’ to strike Grievant’s criminal allegations and Evidence against the judge’s peer group of other judges (or the magistrate’s supervisory judges) – constitute a violation of the <u>Rules of Decision Act</u> (June 25, 1948, Ch. 646, 62 Stat. 944) as codified in <u>28 U.S.C. § 1652</u> ?” (“ <i>The laws of the several states, except where the Constitution or treaties of the United States or acts of Congress otherwise require or provide, shall be regarded as rules of decision in civil action in the courts of the United States, in cases where they apply.</i> ”)” .....	10
 <b><u>QUESTION #2</u></b> –	
“Is the federal judiciary barred under the <u>Rules of Decision Act</u> (1948) and the <u>Rules Enabling Act</u> (1934) from using Article I (‘ <i>legislative</i> ’) rulings to limit or ‘ <i>abridge</i> ’ substantive state and federally granted rights, as was done recently when Magistrate Hluchaniuk issued his ‘ <u>Order</u> ’ and ‘ <u>Amended Order</u> ’ to ‘ <i>strike</i> ’ the substantive Evidence and Allegations that Grievant Schied entered into the Court of Record in support of Grievant’s ‘ <u>Writ for Change of Venue</u> ’ out of the District Court in located in Detroit, <b>based upon clear evidence of theft and corruption infiltrating that federal court?</b> ” .....	10
 <b><u>QUESTION #3</u></b> –	
“Is the federal judiciary barred from both <u>legislating and adjudicating</u> its own legislation using a Magistrate subject to Article I limitations – on an issue <b>concerning allegations of “bad” and/or criminal behavior against federal judges</b> – as was done in context of Magistrate Hluchaniuk <b>using ‘local court (procedural) rules’ to summarily and substantially ‘strike’ the incriminating Evidence of Grievant’s filings without adjudicating the ‘merits’ of the controversy?</b> ” .....	10

**QUESTION #4 –**

“Does the federal judiciary have any obligation to ‘*independently*’ investigate and/or adjudicate controversy against the infringement of rights by government when the judiciary itself – though being constitutionally ‘*independent*’ is also lawfully ‘*bound*’ to constitutional guarantees under Article III – is the entity being charged with that unconstitutional behavior?” .....10

Summary basis of a Mandamus for Interlocutory Appeal.....12

The 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA’s January 2016 actions provided the model for a “*pattern and practice*” of criminal conduct leading to a calculable consequence of damages and a \$230 MILLION claim against the “UNITED STATES” .....14

The following thus depicts – *prima facie* on the face of their cover-pages by captioning – what exactly was *dismissed*, in a *pattern and practice* that coincides with the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA’s *dismissal* actions, WITHOUT *litigation of the merits*.....20

The so-called “*judge*,” “*magistrates*,” “*attorneys*,” and “*clerks*,” as all registered “*State BAR of Michigan*” members *acting as “officers of the [United States] court*,” have never responded and thus, acquiesced to the eleven (11) formal “*Criminal Complaints*” and the \$230 MILLION *claim in commerce* against them and the United States; and are similarly unresponsive to Grievant/ Claimant/Crime Victim/PAG Cornell Squires’ filing of “*Writ of Error Coram Nobis Against [Avern Cohn’s] Fraudulent 6-Page Administrative Memorandum and Order...’ And “Order of Contempt of Court... ”* with a “*Ledger of Damages*” against these “*criminally accused*” .....26

Conclusion and Argument for PAG David Schied’s and PAG Cornell Squires’ “*Order for Relief*” being by way of this instant “*Order for En Banc Review and Answer in Report on ‘Quo Warranto’*” .....29

Certificate of Compliance.....1 page

Appendix of Exhibits (inclusive of 16 itemized entries).....10 pages

**HERE COMES** Grievants/Claimants/Crime Victims and Private Attorney Generals, David Schied and Cornell Squires, acting in their own interest, in the interest of at least fourteen (14) “joinder” Grievants/Claimants, and in the public’s interest, to address the grossly fraudulent actions taken by “*judicial usurpers*” Michael Hluchaniuk, Stephanie Davis and Avern Cohn in treasonous effort to criminally “*aid and abet*” their fellow State BAR of Michigan members in the cover-up of *domestic terrorism* that has long been inundating in the region of American known by its territorial boundaries as “*Wayne County*,” otherwise under the control and operation of the incorporated case co-Defendants known as the “*Charter County of Wayne*” and their “*errors and omissions*” and “*terrorism*” insurance carriers, the *Insurance Company of the State of Pennsylvania* (“ICSOP”) and the corporate *American Insurance Group* (“AIG”), a so-called “*judge*” by the name of Karen Khalil and her entourage of the *Charter Township of Redford, et al*, and their “*risk management*” insurance carrier, the *Michigan Municipal Risk Management Authority* (“MMRMA”).

The explicit history for this case, though extensive, will be limited to an overview since the subject of this instant filing – a 182-page common law “*Quo Warranto Demand for Proving ‘Jurisdiction,’ Article III ‘Good Behavior,’ and Authentication of Oaths and Bonds...*” – which was filed about midway through the lower court proceedings in the aftermath of unlawful action taken by the first magistrate assigned to the case, a man named Michael Hluchaniuk who “*retired*”

immediately after doing numerous dirty deeds against this case and against other Americans made “*subject*” to his criminal activities.

The full *original* name of the filing now under this instant ORDER for “*En Banc*” review and ‘*answer*’ report by the entirety of the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court bench is:

***"PAG" David Schied's State Ex-Rel and Ex-Parte 'Quo Warranto' Demand for Proving 'Jurisdiction,' Article III 'Good Behavior' and Authentication of Oaths and Bonds in Light of Prima Facie Evidence Proving That Circuit Court Judges are Fostering 'Domestic Terrorism;' Or Alternatively, for the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit Judges to Comply With This Instant 'Mandamus for Bond and/or 'Risk Management' Insurance Surrender, For Victims' Relief Under 18 U.S.C. §3771 and 18 U.S.C. §4; and for Other Declaratory Relief' by Way of 'Errors & Omissions.' Malfesance, and Other Coverage Information"***

As shown by the time-stamped “*Certificate of Service,*” the time-stamped *cover page* for the above-named filing, and the time-stamped cover page for the “*Appendix of [108] Exhibits in Support*” of the same, the common law “*Quo Warranto*” demand was filed into the record of the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court on January 12, 2016, in the case referenced by number on the cover page of this instant filing. *See* **“EXHIBIT #1”** attached herein for the Evidence of these time-stamped pages, as also located in the Article III Court of Record as posted directly on the Internet and available for public download at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/010816\\_QuoWarranto\\_6thCircuitJudges/Time-StampedCvrPages\\_QuoWarrAppendixCertofSvc.pdf](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/010816_QuoWarranto_6thCircuitJudges/Time-StampedCvrPages_QuoWarrAppendixCertofSvc.pdf)

**FACTUAL BASIS FOR THIS “ORDER FOR EN BANC REVIEW  
AND ANSWER IN REPORT ON ‘QUO WARRANTO’ DEMAND”**

This instant action is being taken because, before any such filing as an “*appeal*” is to be made to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, certain questions presented by the *Quo Warranto* demand needs to be answered to ascertain the constitutional legitimacy of the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court judges as “*Article III lifetime employed*” judges, in light of the certainty of *Facts* and *Evidence* about the *behavior* of these judges, as presented along with that filing.

Further, what needs to be answered is the existence and location of performance bonds, blanket bonds, individual and blanket forms of *risk management* insurance policies, error and omissions insurance programs, and *terrorism* insurance coverage for these federal judges and other court employees, guaranteeing to the public *faithful performance* and/or *dutiful execution* of their *fiduciary* obligations under the *Trust* by which they have subscribed to by their Oaths of Office to the constitutions of the State and the United States.

In this instant, the *Trust* has been repeatedly broken and the Clerk of the Court Deborah Hunt has rebelled against PAG David Schied’s earlier mandate for her forward his reporting of crimes under 18 U.S.C. § 4 and by violating the *Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure* in numerous ways.

For instance, Hunt separated Documents and Evidence from a joint filing of “*Response in Opposition...*” and “*Brief in Support of Response...*” Grievant/PAG

Schied had submitted along with an “Appendix” and a 6-inch stack of 23 listed “Exhibits of Evidence,” when Grievant was otherwise clear that he was submitting these documents to Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals as an Article III Court of Record while acting in Common Law and in *opposition* to proven FRAUDULENT “*motion to dismiss*” filings of Appellees; and while proving Evidence of other crimes previously committed by the Sixth Circuit’s peer group of other co-called state and federal “*judges*.”

See **“EXHIBIT #2”** as:

**“Grievant’s Ex-Parte ‘Writ of Error’ Against 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit Clerk Deborah Hunt’s and Case Manager Robin Baker’s Gross Violation of Oaths & Bonds and FRAP 45(a)(b) and (c); and ‘Mandamus for Bond Surrender; for Victims’ Relief Under 18 U.S.C. § 3771 and 18 U.S.C. § 4; and for Other Declaratory Relief’ by Way of ‘Errors and Omissions,’ Malfeasance, and Other ‘Risk Management’ Insurance Coverage Information”**

which is also found online in the Article III Court of Record for the lower “*court*” case at:

**[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEdM/122915\\_MyRespto6thCirClerkHacking&Art-I-Order/My122915WritofError/122915\\_EntireWritWritofErroron6thCirClerkViolations.pdf](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEdM/122915_MyRespto6thCirClerkHacking&Art-I-Order/My122915WritofError/122915_EntireWritWritofErroron6thCirClerkViolations.pdf)**

Note that this document is also listed in the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA docketing records as DKT # 20 “Writ of Error.”

As shown in the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA’s own records, “*Clerk*” Hunt had issued an “Order” in December 2015 which included by her own admission that Deborah

Hunt had *tampered with* or otherwise *stolen* from the official court file the following document already *filed* by PAG David Schied, after time-stamping it:

“Grievant’s “Appendix of Exhibits” in Support of ‘**Brief in Support**’ of ‘**Response in Opposition**’ to Attorney James Mellon’s Fraudulent ‘Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction’ on Behalf of his Client(s) the Michigan Municipal Risk Management Authority (‘MMRMA’) in Context of a ‘Pattern and Practice’ of Frivolous Filings and Criminal Fraud Upon the Court by Attorney Mellon Throughout the Lower Court Proceedings and Now in the Higher Court”

Attorney Mellon’s “Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction” was what the Sixth Circuit tribunal of “judges” R. Guy Cole Jr., Eugene Siler, Jr., and Richard Allen Griffin used on 1/22/16 to “dismiss” the entirety of Grievant/PAG Schied’s “Writ of Mandamus for Interlocutory Appeal” **without address of the contents of that appeal or the contents of Grievant/PAG Schied’s “Memorandum of Law in Support” that was filed along with that appeal.** (Bold emphasis added)

The (fraudulent) “dismissal” instrument of the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court tribunal is found in the Article III Court of Record online at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/012216\\_6thCircuitDismissInterlocAppeal/012216\\_OrderDismissingInterlocutoryAppeal.pdf](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/012216_6thCircuitDismissInterlocAppeal/012216_OrderDismissingInterlocutoryAppeal.pdf)

The “Writ of Mandamus for Interlocutory Appeal” and “Memorandum of Law in Support”, along with supporting Exhibits of Evidence as filed on 11/18/15 in the Article III Court of Record, are found at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/111815\\_WritMandamusInterlocAppeal&MemorandumLaw/](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/111815_WritMandamusInterlocAppeal&MemorandumLaw/)

As an incriminating matter of material FACT, there is no sign in the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA docketing record that the “*Writ of Mandamus for Interlocutory Appeal*” and “*Memorandum of Law in Support*” were ever placed into the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court record after being time-stamped on 11/18/15 as “*filed*” by the U.S. District Court. Instead, the first docket entry to the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA is a misleading notation dated 12/1/15 stating that a three-page “*Notice filed BY David Schied*” was filed, which was actually a *fraudulent* LETTER written by “*case manager*” Robin Baker on 12/1/15 misrepresenting TO David Schied that “*This appeal has been docketed as case number 15-2464*” **when, in fact, the “*appeal*” and the supporting “*memorandum*” is nowhere to be found in the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA docketing records.** (Bold emphasis added)

See “**EXHIBIT 3**” as a copy of the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA Docketing Record and Docket Item #1 as three pages of nothing more than the fraudulent letter by Robin Baker – which was written with knowledge that **Grievant/PAG David Schied was entering the Sixth Circuit with a “*forma pauperis*” standing** – was not filing electronically, **and therefore had no access to the electronic filing records being maintained by the “*Clerk*” Deborah Hunt and the “*Case Manager*” Robin Baker. As such, and because neither Hunt nor Baker were providing Grievant/PAG David Schied with any “*electronic document stamp*” as proof of**



electronic filing of documents, Grievant/PAG David Schied had no choice but to TRUST the face value of the (fraudulent) letter which misrepresented that the “Writ of Mandamus for Interlocutory Appeal” and “Memorandum of Support” accompanying that “*appeal*” had been “*docketed*” (when the Evidence found later shows that these documents actually had not been “*docketed*”). (Bold emphasis added)

The location in the Article III (lower) Court of Record where the above-referenced three-page “*fraudulent letter*,” as dated 12/1/16 and written by “*case manager*” Robin Baker is found, and where the “Writ of Error...and “Mandamus for Bond Surrender” written by Grievant/PAG David Schied against Hunt and Baker is found, is online at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/120115\\_6thCircuitonInterlocutoryMatr/](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/120115_6thCircuitonInterlocutoryMatr/)

The location in the Article III (lower) Court of Record where Grievant/PAG David Schied filed his the above-referenced 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA “*Docket*” record, being filed with the federal “*District Court*” and posted publicly shortly after discovery in PACER records by PAG Cornell Squires and placed as “*Exhibit G*” to Grievants/PAG’s filing of a “Writ of Show Cause...and...Order for Competency Hearing...” against the 92-year old “*judge*” Avern Cohn as found at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/062016\\_Writ4Sshow](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/062016_Writ4Sshow)

[CauseonMot2StayProceedings+Order4JudgeCompetencyHearing/Exhibits/EX G MyQuoWarrantoinSixthCircuitTENDEREDisPENDING.pdf](#)

Note that the full name of the “Writ of Show Cause...and...Order for Competency Hearing...” filing referenced above is captioned below:

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

and

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

The entirety of the above-captioned filing is also located in the Article III (lower) Court of Record at the following location, as proof that for quite some time prior to his dismissing the case, the 92-year “*lifetime employed judge*” operating from the U.S. District Court in Detroit had the opportunity to be well-acquainted with the allegations against him personally, as well as those others of his brethren of State BAR of Michigan members, against whom Grievant/Claimant/PAG David Schied now has a \$230 MILLION claim:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/062016\\_Writ4Sshow](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/062016_Writ4Sshow)

With regard to 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA “*clerk*” Deborah Hunt, her not providing Grievant/PAG with a “*proof of electronic filing*” (in any way or form) was a gross violation of the “*Sixth Circuit Guide to Electronic Filing*” (sections 9, 10 and 13) as was clearly documented PRIOR TO the filing of the *Quo Warranto* demand and PRIOR TO the tribunal of Cole, Siler and Griffin summarily “*dismissing*” the *Writ of Mandamus for Interlocutory Appeal* without litigation of the merits, and apparently TREASONOUSLY *under color of law* and without even looking at either the “*appeal*” or the “*memorandum of support.*” Such documentation of the Sixth Circuit COA “*clerk’s*” and “*case manager’s*” derelection was fully elaborated upon in Grievant/PAG David Schied’s “*Writ of Error*” (i.e., see again, “**Exhibit #2**”) which also was subsequently ignored and remains today as still in need of a full address by all of the Sixth Circuit COA “*judges.*”

### **BASIS FOR FILING THE INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL ON 11/18/15**

What was never addressed by the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA’s “*decision*” to *dismiss* the Interlocutory Appeal **without litigation of the merits** was and remains a matter of significant public interest. **In fact, the following four questions presented by Grievant David Schied in the “*appeal*” that was supposedly forwarded to the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA by the U.S. District Court were never**

answered by the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA when granting “*DOE #1*” (“MMRMA” attorney) James Mellon’s “*Motion to Dismiss For Lack of Jurisdiction*”:

**QUESTION #1** –

“Does a federal District Court judge’s (or magistrate’s) failure to observe state laws and state court rules governing the judicial obligation to investigate one litigant’s (Grievant Schied’s) criminal ‘*complaint*’ – and the selective application instead of ‘*local court rules*’ against that same litigant in response to a fellow State BAR of Michigan member’s ‘*motion*’ to strike Grievant’s criminal allegations and Evidence against the judge’s peer group of other judges (or the magistrate’s supervisory judges) – constitute a violation of the *Rules of Decision Act* (June 25, 1948, Ch. 646, 62 Stat. 944) as codified in 28 U.S.C. § 1652 ?” (*The laws of the several states, except where the Constitution or treaties of the United States or acts of Congress otherwise require or provide, shall be regarded as rules of decision in civil action in the courts of the United States, in cases where they apply.*’)”

**QUESTION #2** –

“Is the federal judiciary barred under the *Rules of Decision Act* (1948) and the *Rules Enabling Act* (1934) from using Article I (‘*legislative*’) rulings to limit or ‘*abridge*’ substantive state and federally granted rights, as was done recently when Magistrate Hluchaniuk issued his ‘*Order*’ and ‘*Amended Order*’ to ‘*strike*’ the substantive Evidence and Allegations that Grievant Schied entered into the Court of Record in support of Grievant’s ‘*Writ for Change of Venue*’ out of the District Court in located in Detroit, **based upon clear evidence of theft and corruption infiltrating that federal court?**”

**QUESTION #3** –

“Is the federal judiciary barred from both legislating and adjudicating its own legislation using a Magistrate subject to Article I limitations – on an issue **concerning allegations of “*bad*” and/or criminal *behavior* against federal judges** – as was done in context of Magistrate Hluchaniuk **using ‘*local court (procedural) rules*’ to summarily and substantially ‘*strike*’ the incriminating Evidence of Grievant’s filings without adjudicating the ‘*merits*’ of the controversy?**”

**QUESTION #4** –

“Does the federal judiciary have any obligation to ‘*independently*’ investigate and/or adjudicate controversy against the infringement of rights by government when the judiciary itself – though being constitutionally ‘*independent*’ is also lawfully ‘*bound*’ to constitutional guarantees under Article III – is the entity being charged with that unconstitutional behavior?”

The location online of the above-referenced “Writ of Mandamus for Interlocutory Appeal” in the Article III Court of Record for the lower court case is:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/111815\\_WritMandamusInterlocAppeal&MemorandumLaw/EntireWritofMandamus4InterlocutoryAppeal.pdf](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/111815_WritMandamusInterlocAppeal&MemorandumLaw/EntireWritofMandamus4InterlocutoryAppeal.pdf)

The above-referenced same four “Questions” were presented in the “Memorandum of Law in Support...” accompanying that “Writ of Mandamus for Interlocutory Appeal” as found in the Article III (lower)

Court of Record at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/111815\\_WritMandamusInterlocAppeal&MemorandumLaw/EntireMemorandumofLaw.pdf](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/111815_WritMandamusInterlocAppeal&MemorandumLaw/EntireMemorandumofLaw.pdf)

The full captioning on the cover page of that “Memorandum of Law in Support...” is:

“GRIEVANT DAVID SCHIED’S ‘MEMORANDUM OF LAW’ IN SUPPORT OF GRIEVANT’S ‘WRIT OF MANDAMUS FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL’) WITH QUESTIONS OF LAW PERTAINING TO WHETHER JUDICIAL ‘LEGISLATION’ IS CONSTITUTIONAL; AND WHETHER JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE AUTHORIZES ‘BAD’ BEMAVIOR; AND WHETHER ‘SUBSTANTIVE’ EVIDENCE CAN BE ‘PROCEDURALLY’ STRICKEN; AND WHETHER EVIDENCE OF A ‘PATTERN & PRACTICE’ OF GOVERNMENT COERCION CONSTITUTES TREASON AND/OR ‘DOMESTIC TERRORISM’”

The opening pages of the “Writ of Mandamus for Interlocutory Appeal...” state as follows the basis for the filing that was summarily “*dismissed*” by the 6<sup>th</sup>

Circuit COA without litigation of the merits of this appeal:

(quotation marks omitted)

### **SUMMARY BASIS OF A MANDAMUS FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL**

This “*Writ of Mandamus for Interlocutory Appeal*” is brought importantly because of compelling circumstances involving the two very differing contentions of the opposing parties, and the unique role that the decision-makers play in this District Court, as both the traditional adjudicators and the criminally “*accused*.”

On one hand, **Grievant David Schied has presented compelling Evidence of the alleged crimes committed by the “*decision-makers*” own peer group of other United States District Court judges, which is subject to cited Michigan statutes and court rules requiring “*any judge with “reasonable cause to believe a crime or crimes have been committed” to begin an investigation and to order an immediate arrest warrant.*** Such reasonable cause has been defined under Michigan law as being a formal “*complaint*,” sworn and signed by Oath and presented before a judicial official. What presents the greatest area of contention and controversy regarding this circumstance is the FACT that the criminal allegations and the Evidence submitted to this federal District Court pertains to constitutional and statutory violations perpetrated by members of both the Michigan and the United States judiciary.

On the other hand, the State BAR of Michigan attorneys representing the quasi-government as “*chartered*” corporations of co-defendants and their “*self-insured*” risk management associations contend simply that the criminal allegations of Grievant are the equivalent of delusional aberrations being perpetrated by Grievant as a “*paper terrorist*,” a “*vexatious litigant*,” a “*frivolous filer*” and “*member of the sovereign citizen (terrorist) movement*.” They present both state and federal judicial rulings that they conclude proves “*prima facie*” that their mischaracterizations about Grievant’s litigation (and “*terrorist*”) history are correct, and which somehow prove that his allegations of criminal government corruption and racketeering are ludicrous and the deranged.

The crux of the problem herein rests in the FACT that the co-defendants and their attorneys have presented ONLY the rulings in those former state and federal cases as somehow supplying the “*prima facie*” evidence that the current federal civil allegations in the District Court, levied by Grievant against some old and some new co-defendants, are unfounded and merely part of the ongoing disturbing pattern of Grievant. The co-defendants are thus using these contentions as their reasoning for dismissing Grievant’s “*Complaint/Claim for Damages*” altogether, in summary fashion, based upon their “*pleadings alone*” and/or “*in lieu of answer*.”

Grievant, meanwhile, has “*responded*” completely and competently to the co-defendants’ assertions, which consist of mere repetitions of unsupported written “*denials*” and formal declarations that they “*do not have sufficient information to form an answer to the complaint*,” compelling Grievant to rely upon his own “*proofs*” of Evidence. In such response, Grievant has submitted mounds of Evidence and explanatory statements proving that **those prior “*administrative*” and/or “*legislative*” rulings of state and federal judges were never litigated on the merits of those earlier “*complaints*,” but instead were summarily dismissed in a “*pattern and practice*” that otherwise repeatedly deprived Grievant of his constitutional guarantees to due process – **CRIMINALLY** – *under color of law*,**

and in the similar fashion to which the co-defendants were subsequently – and continuing – to request the dismissal of Grievant's current "*complaint/claims*" against them in this instant federal case.

The federal legal issue at hand is defined by the FACT that **Co-Defendants have thus sought to have most, if not all, of Grievant's incriminating statements and controverting Evidence against those previous state and federal judges "stricken" from the instant case and Court of Record by claim that Grievant's "Response" filings exceed the page limit for responsive filings as set by the "local court rules" of this federal District Court. Grievant's counter-argument is that certain Michigan state statutes and court rules – and even federal codes and regulations – as well as both Michigan and United States constitutions govern both the substantive and procedural obligations of the federal judges and magistrates, who are otherwise respectively charged with either judicially adjudicating or administrating this case.**

At this point in the administration of this case – and with the above being a very abbreviated summary of the degree to which Grievant's Evidence implicates the employees and court "*officials*" of the District Court of Detroit in particular as being in many ways "dishonest" – **Magistrate Michael Hluchaniuk has administratively granted the co-defendants' "motion to strike" and has *sua sponte* stricken other of Grievant's filings while threatening to "recommend dismissal of this lawsuit in its entirety" so to deny Grievant his constitutionally guaranteed right to a jury trial on these facts.** Grievant contends that such action is being undertaken in gross mischaracterization of Grievant personally and as a private party to this case, under color of the Court's interest and obligation to all parties to expeditiously and efficiently manage this case.

Grievant has filed his "*objection*" to the magistrate's "Order" and "Amended Order Striking Responses and Motions..." of Grievant, citing that **certain state and federal statutes and state and federal constitutions supersede "local court rules" in governing the substantive results of this circumstance and the procedural path that the federal judiciary should take toward the substantive resolve of this procedural controversy.** Thus, Grievant is filing this instant "Writ of Mandamus in Order for Interlocutory Appeal" along with a "Memorandum of Law" in support of the mandamus that brings "Questions of Law" specifically pertaining to: 1) "*Whether judicial 'legislation' is constitution;*" 2) "*Whether judicial 'independence' authorizes 'bad' behavior;*" 3) "*Whether 'substantive' evidence can be 'procedurally' stricken;*" and, 4) "*Whether a 'pattern and practice' of government 'coercion' constitutes 'treason' and/or 'domestic terrorism.'*"

**THE 6<sup>TH</sup> CIRCUIT COA'S JANUARY 2016 ACTIONS PROVIDED THE MODEL FOR A "PATTERN AND PRACTICE" OF CRIMINAL CONDUCT LEADING TO A CALCULABLE CONSEQUENCE OF DAMAGES AND A \$230 MILLION CLAIM AGAINST THE "UNITED STATES"**

The underlying case in which the common law "Quo Warranto" demand was written was one in which "*the accused*" – Karen Khalil and numerous others being employed in the capacities of "*judge*," "*bailiffs*," and "*police officers*" of the Redford Township Police Department and **having no personal or subject matter jurisdiction** over a man sitting silently with a note pad in the public gallery of a courtroom in quiet observation and audit of questionable local government activities – **criminally searched, seized, kidnapped and falsely incarcerated Grievant/PAG David Schied for a period of "30 days" while furnishing no due process or any form of documentation of these activities for a period of a year and a half.**

The documentation found a year and a half after the crime, with the help of a former Michigan State Police investigator and yielded only a fraudulent "Judgment of Sentence" created by the "*domestic terrorist*" Karen Khalil which reflected a *fraudulent* case number. That "Judgment of Sentence" also reflected a *fraudulent* claim that David Schied had committed himself to a "*guilty*" plea and made the *fraudulent* claim that a public defender was offered by the court but "*denied*" by David Schied. A *fraudulent* court transcript was also created by the Court which did NOT reflect any of assertions in the Judgment of Sentence" but nevertheless



reflected a previously non-existent “*case number*” for the kidnapping of David Schied from the public gallery of the courtroom. **The common law claim in damages for that “state created danger” and the criminal activity leading to a false imprisonment for 30-days was established at \$150 MILLION.** (Bold emphasis)

The case was filed in the only available brick-and-mortar venue of the “UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,” being clearly addressed as the Article III “*District Court of the United States*,” operating in varied federal locations within the Eastern District of Michigan. **From the onset of filing his case, Grievant/PAG David Schied had reported a CRIME OF THEFT of important court documents in connection with the Clerk of the Court David Weaver and others connected with the corporate STATE OF MICHIGAN operating in and around Detroit. Evidence shows those documents were stolen – at the time Summons were being approved and even before Grievant/PAG David Schied had received back the summons, which had also been criminally replaced by altered summons changing the classification of the “*defendants*” before being “*approved*” – so as to provide the opposing “*litigants*” and their attorneys favorable treatment going forward in the case. Thus, for these and other good reasons supported by Evidence, Grievant/PAG David Schied was demanding – in writing – that these reports of crimes be acted upon and that the**

**administration of that federal court case be managed far away from the “domestic terrorists” operating the federal “court” in Detroit.** (Bold emphasis)

The Evidence of the crime of USDC “*clerk of the court*” David Weaver’s crimes and the notification of the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA “*clerk of the court*” Deborah Hunt about these crimes by letter dated 12/11/15 addressed to Hunt – which was accompanied by and listing such letter in the “*Certificate of Service*” on the “*servicing*” of these documents to Hunt – as found herein as **“EXHIBIT 4,”** and as also located online in the Article III Court of Records at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/120115\\_6thCircuitonInterlocutoryMattr/010816\\_ResponseinOpposition2Mot2DismissInterlocAppeal/121115\\_MyRespons2FraudMot/121115\\_CertofServ+Letr2casemgrRobinBaker\\_changecaption.pdf](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/120115_6thCircuitonInterlocutoryMattr/010816_ResponseinOpposition2Mot2DismissInterlocAppeal/121115_MyRespons2FraudMot/121115_CertofServ+Letr2casemgrRobinBaker_changecaption.pdf)

Five months and with a changeover of two more judges leaving a 92-year old judge in charge of a case in which no judicial actions had taken place and in which a first magistrate was assigned by the “*court*” but immediately rejected by Grievant/PAG David Schied, that first “*magistrate*” went forward to **procedurally** “*strike*” four substantive filings of Grievant/PAG Schied proving numerous previous years of domestic terrorist activity in the operations of the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT operating in Detroit and leading to various fraudulent federal judges’ previous “*rulings*”. That (first) magistrate, Michael Hluchaniuk, then immediately “*retired*” from his position from the federal court.

The significance of the Writ of Mandamus for Interlocutory Appeal and “Memorandum of Law in Support” that was filed in the lower federal District Court by Grievant/PAG Schied in response to Hluchaniuk’s “*striking*” of those documents, was that it presented the Argument – backed by Evidence – that federal rules used procedurally to “*strike*” or “*dismiss*” substantive filings do not supersede state laws instructing “*any judge*” on how criminal complaints are to be properly managed. (Bold emphasis)

The filings both inferred and explicitly stated that even federal judges and magistrates were not “*immune*” to either the underlying principles of the Rules Enabling Act mandating that *substantive filings* NOT be *procedurally* dismissed, and that neither judges nor magistrates were “*immune*” from prosecution for the crimes they have committed, even if those crimes were committed while “*on the bench*” (as in Khalil’s case) or while summarily “*dismissing*” earlier cases otherwise warranting “*litigation of the merits*” and presenting clear Evidence of other lower level CRIMES being perpetrated by these so-called “*magistrates*” and these so-called “*judges*” fellow members of the State BAR of Michigan. (Again, bold is emphasized)

All of these above-related important FACTS were flagrantly, tortuously and treasonously ignored by the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court *tribunal* of “*judges*” R. Guy Cole Jr., Eugene Siler, Jr., and Richard Allen Griffin on 1/22/16 when they “*dismissed*” the entirety of Grievant/PAG Schied’s “Writ of Mandamus for Interlocutory Appeal”

without address of the contents of that *appeal* or the contents of Grievant/PAG Schied's "Memorandum of Law in Support" that was filed along with that *appeal*, and while *fraudulently* claiming – without reason or explanation – that the magistrate's "Order of Dismissal" of the four substantive filings was somehow *not* a "*collateral order*." (See "**EXHIBIT #5**" which is also located online in the Article III Court of Record at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/012216\\_6thCircuitDismissInterlocAppeal/012216\\_OrderDismissingInterlocutoryAppeal.pdf](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/012216_6thCircuitDismissInterlocAppeal/012216_OrderDismissingInterlocutoryAppeal.pdf) )

Similarly, what was *treasonously* disregarded by the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA is found in "**EXHIBIT #6**" as forty-five (45) pages of explicit detailing of what exactly was being provided in "108 Exhibits" along with that "Quo Warranto demand" filing as Evidence of the *domestic terrorism* being carried out by certain numbers of judges operating in the UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT, the federal judges operating the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS in the Eastern District of Michigan, and the various STATE OF MICHIGAN courts being operated and under the supervision and control of the Michigan Supreme Court.

As a result of the UNITED STATES' 6<sup>th</sup> "Circus" (Court of Appeals) "*tribunal's*" treasonous display of dereliction, gross negligence, malfeasance, dishonor, and supplying a safe-haven for their fellow "*domestic terrorists*" by their refusal to address ANY of the contents of ...

- 1) the “Writ of Mandamus for Interlocutory Appeal...”
- 2) the “Memorandum of Law in Support (of Interlocutory Appeal)...”
- 3) the aforementioned “Grievant’s Ex-Parte ‘Writ of Error’ Against 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit Clerk Deborah Hunt’s and Case Manager Robin Baker’s Gross Violation of Oaths & Bonds and FRAP 45(a)(b) and (c); and ‘Mandamus for Bond Surrender,
- 4) the “PAG David Schied’s State Ex-Rel and Ex-Parte ‘Quo Warranto’ Demand for Proving ‘Jurisdiction, ‘ Article III ‘Good Behavior’ and Authentication of Oaths and Bonds...” or,
- 5) the “PAG” David Schied’s State Ex-Rel and Ex-Parte ‘Appendix of Exhibits in Support of Quo Warranto’...

**... the “officers” of the lower federal “District Court” operating in SE Michigan found the means by which they would repeat their crimes “under color of law” against PAGs Schied and Squires, against the 14 additional “Joinder Claimants” (who entered the federal case on 3/31/16 with similar outcries about domestic terrorism being carried out by the co-Defendants operating as the “Charter County of Wayne” as provided formally in sworn and notarized Affidavits), and against the public at large, through the same type of FRAUD that PAG David Schied had been reporting throughout the previous decade as coming from both the State courts and the federal courts operating throughout the “Eastern District of Michigan,” and particularly those of the “Southern Division” in and around the co-Defendants collectively known as the incorporated “Charter County of Wayne.”**

As provided herein by **“EXHIBIT #7”** as the time-stamped “cover page” of the lower federal court filing dated 3/31/16 in filing of the following documents along with fourteen (14) separate “Sworn and Notarized Affidavits...” of “Joinder Grievants/Claimants/Crime Victims,” each in testimony about these *Joinder Claimants* having been denied their

First Amendment rights to “*access the courts*” and “*redress of grievances*” by means of *domestic terrorism* and the *corruption* of the “*courts*,” judges, attorneys, clerks, etc. The full sets of all of these “*Joinder*” filings, along with the “*Certificate of Service*” for all of these documents, are located on the Internet in the Article III Court of Record at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/033116\\_PAGs\\_Schied&Squires\\_Joinderof-14-ClaimantsCrimeVictims/](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/033116_PAGs_Schied&Squires_Joinderof-14-ClaimantsCrimeVictims/)

The following are just a sampling of the plethora of other filings that the combined actions of the second “*magistrate*” to enter the case (Stephanie Davis) and the 92-year “*puppet judge*” (Avern Cohn) did administratively when summarily *dismissing* PAGs Schied and Squires’ (and the other 14+ “*Joinder Claimants*”) filings which, overall throughout the case filings, included over fifty (50) UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVITS testifying about the details of other “*domestic terrorist acts*” being carried out in denial of First Amendment rights to have “*meaningful access the court*” for the purpose of “*redress of grievances.*”

The following thus depicts – prima facie on the face of their cover-pages by captioning – what exactly was dismissed, in an unconstitutional pattern and practice that coincides with the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA’s unconstitutional dismissal actions, WITHOUT litigation of the merits and while depriving Grievant/PAG

David Schied of his First Amendment guaranteed “*right to redress of grievance*” through “*meaningful*” access to the Court(s):

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

and

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

The above is provided herein by “*cover page*” as **“EXHIBIT #8”**

time-stamped as filed in the lower federal court on 6/21/16, as also located in its entirety on the Internet in the Article III Court of Record at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/062016\\_Writ4SshowCauseonMot2StayProceedings+Order4JudgeCompetencyHearing/062016\\_Writf4ShowCauseonMot2StayProceedings+Order4JudgeCompetencyHearing.pdf](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/062016_Writ4SshowCauseonMot2StayProceedings+Order4JudgeCompetencyHearing/062016_Writf4ShowCauseonMot2StayProceedings+Order4JudgeCompetencyHearing.pdf)

- 2) **“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”;**

and,

**“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*

The above-named two Affidavits are provided herein by “cover pages” as **“EXHIBIT #9”** which were filed in the lower federal court on 7/20/16 along with the following time-stamped filing of “Writ of Error” and “Criminal Complaint” (i.e., see also **“Exhibit #9”**) about actions taken by the second (usurper) magistrate to enter the federal case, Stephanie Davis....

*“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”*

...which are all also located in their entirety on the Internet in the Article III

Court of Record at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/071916\\_WritofErroronMagisFraudOrdertoRespond/](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/071916_WritofErroronMagisFraudOrdertoRespond/)

3) *“PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERALS ‘PAG’ DAVID SCHIED'S AND CORNELL SQUIRES’ ‘ORDER OF DEFAULT JUDGMENT’ ON NUMEROUS UNREBUTTED CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS AGAINST DOES #1 THROUGH #4 (James Mellon, Jeffrey Clark, Warren White and Charles "No Appearance" Browning) AND OTHER ACTS OF DERELICTION AND ‘CONSPIRACY TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT AS COMMITTED BETWEEN 6/30/16 AND 8/11/16 BY MAGISTRATE STEPHANIE DAVIS”*

and,

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

and,

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



The following is provided herein by “cover pages” as **“EXHIBIT #10”** time-stamped as filed in the lower federal court on 8/25/16, as also located in its entirety on the Internet in the Article III Court of Record at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEdM/082516\\_MyDefaultJudgmntFolwupCrimeRpt&MemofPeoplesRights/](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEdM/082516_MyDefaultJudgmntFolwupCrimeRpt&MemofPeoplesRights/)

- 4) “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” as located online in the Article III Court of Record at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEdM/082516\\_MyDefaultJudgmntFolwupCrimeRpt&MemofPeoplesRights/MyExhibits/EX\\_B\\_MemorandumofPeoplesRights\\_KhalilCase.pdf](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEdM/082516_MyDefaultJudgmntFolwupCrimeRpt&MemofPeoplesRights/MyExhibits/EX_B_MemorandumofPeoplesRights_KhalilCase.pdf)

The above “Memorandum on Rights of (“We”), The People...” is labeled “Exhibit B” in support of the “Order of Default Judgment...” as both are also shown in **“Exhibit #10”** to have been filed on 8/25/16. As found in the Article III Court of Record linked above, the body of the “Memorandum on Rights of (“We”), The People...” totals 166 pages in length.

- 5) “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”

As provided herein by “cover page” as **“EXHIBIT #11”** time-stamped as labeled “Exhibit A” filed in the lower federal court on 8/25/16 along with the above-referenced document. This Affidavit presents the links

and cover-pages in reference to over forty-two (42) other UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVITS that were filed in the federal case in this case, which were all subsequently ignored and “dismissed” by attorneys, magistrates, and judge(s) as all fellow members of the State BAR of Michigan. The location of this document, as found also on the Internet in the Article III Court of Record, is at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/083116\\_2ndCrimeReport2USAttnyGeneralLynchonEvents+MagisCrime/EX\\_A\\_Swo rnFollowUpAffidavit2Lynchwith42AffidavitLinks.pdf](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/083116_2ndCrimeReport2USAttnyGeneralLynchonEvents+MagisCrime/EX_A_Swo rnFollowUpAffidavit2Lynchwith42AffidavitLinks.pdf)

6) “PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERALS (‘PAGs’) SCHIED’S AND SQUIRES’ **‘REPLY IN ‘ORDER OF DENIAL’ AGAINST THE FRAUDULENT ‘RESPONSES’, CHOCK FULL OF ‘ERRORS AND OMISSIONS’** , FROM ZENNA ELHASAN, DAVIDDE STELLA, AND ‘DOE’ JEFFREY CLARK TO 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’...”

and,

“PAGs SCHIED’S AND SQUIRES’ ‘ORDER’ NAMING OF ZENNA (‘No Appearance’) ELHASAN AS “DOE #5” AND DAVIDDE STELLA AS “DOE #6” **BASED ON PERSISTING PATTERNS OF FRAUD, CORRUPTION, RACKETEERING, AND COVER-UP OF THE “DOMESTIC TERRORISM” BEING COMMITTED BY THEIR CLIENTS OPERATING CRIMINALLY AS THE ‘CHARTER COUNTY OF WAYNE’”**

and,

“PAGs’ FORMAL FILING OF **ELEVEN (11) AUTHENTICATED CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS**”

The above joint-filing is provided herein by the “*Certificate of Service*” and “cover page” as **“EXHIBIT #12”** dated as mailed on 9/11/16

and as time-stamped “*filed*” in the lower federal court (along with the time-stamped “*Eleven (11) Criminal Complaints*” below), as also located in its entirety on the Internet in the Article III Court of Record at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/091216\\_MyReply2twoRedford&WCFraudRespons2MyDefaultJudg&Obj/](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/091216_MyReply2twoRedford&WCFraudRespons2MyDefaultJudg&Obj/)

7) “*Eleven (11) Authenticated Criminal Complaints*” – each time-stamped by the lower “*District Court*” on 9/13/16 – which were each signed before a Notary Public for the State of Michigan on 9/9/16 as completed on an “AO-91” official document of the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT. Copies of these official, notarized “*Criminal Complaint(s)*” documents (AO-91) are attached herein as “**EXHIBIT #13**” and found on the Internet in the Article III Court of Record at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/091216\\_MyReply2twoRedford&WCFraudRespons2MyDefaultJudg&Obj/Exhibits/EX\\_2\\_USDCCriminalComplaints-ELEVEN-11-2ppEACH.pdf](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/091216_MyReply2twoRedford&WCFraudRespons2MyDefaultJudg&Obj/Exhibits/EX_2_USDCCriminalComplaints-ELEVEN-11-2ppEACH.pdf)  
and at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/091216\\_USDCFraudCASEDISMISSAL&My11OfficialCrimeReports/USDCCriminalComplaints-ELEVEN-11-TimeStamped.pdf](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/091216_USDCFraudCASEDISMISSAL&My11OfficialCrimeReports/USDCCriminalComplaints-ELEVEN-11-TimeStamped.pdf)

**THE SO-CALLED “JUDGE,” “MAGISTRATES,” “ATTORNEYS,” AND “CLERKS,” AS ALL REGISTERED “STATE BAR OF MICHIGAN” MEMBERS ACTING AS “OFFICERS OF THE [UNITED STATES] COURT,” HAVE NEVER RESPONDED AND THUS, ACQUIESCED TO THE ELEVEN (11) FORMAL “CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS” AND THE \$230 MILLION CLAIM IN COMMERCE AGAINST THEM AND THE UNITED STATES; AND ARE SIMILARLY UNRESPONSIVE TO GRIEVANT/CLAIMANT/CRIME VICTIM/PAG CORNELL SQUIRES’ FILING OF “WRIT OF ERROR CORAM NOBIS AGAINST [Avern Cohn’s] FRAUDULENT 6-PAGE ADMINISTRATIVE ‘Memorandum and Order...’ AND “ORDER OF CONTEMPT OF COURT...” WITH A “LEDGER OF DAMAGES” AGAINST THESE “CRIMINALLY ACCUSED”**

On 10/4/16 Grievant/Claimant/Crime Victim Cornell Squires filed a “Writ of Error Coram Nobis...” in the so-called “*District Court*” in the aftermath of the 92-year old “*judge signing*” (by the questionable typing of “/s/Avern Cohn”) for the *dismissal* of the entirety of David Schied’s original case against Karen Khalil and all of the accompanying “*joinder claimants*” cases as a first-and-only overt act committed by Avern Cohn as a matter of public record (besides assigning the second “*magistrate*” Stephanie Davis in January 2016 against which Grievant/PAG David Schied filed a prompt “*objection*” that was subsequently *ignored* by Avern Cohn, **an affirmative act of criminal malfeasance, dereliction, and gross negligence**). (See **“EXHIBIT #14”** for a full copy of the “Writ of Error Coram Nobis...” time-stamped by the clerk as “*filed*” on 10/4/15.)

Note that a copy of the “Writ of Error Coram Nobis...” that was filed in the Article III Court of Record along with all of its supporting “*Exhibits of Evidence*” are found online at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/100416\\_WritofErrorCoramNobisContemptClaimsInCommerce/](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/100416_WritofErrorCoramNobisContemptClaimsInCommerce/)

Note also that the original filing of Grievant/PAG David Schied's simple two-page "*objection*" to the administrative assignment of an Article I "*magistrate*" to the **Article III common law trespass case** before the federal court, captioned as "*Grievant's Second (2<sup>nd</sup>) Decline to Magistrate Judge Jurisdiction*" is found online in that Article III Court of Record at: (Bold emphasis added)

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/051616\\_Object2AssignofMagistrate/Objection2AssignofMagistrate.pdf](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/051616_Object2AssignofMagistrate/Objection2AssignofMagistrate.pdf)

Importantly, labeled as "**Exhibit #17**" to the "*Writ of Error Coram Nobis,*" a document to which the fiduciary "*government actors*" as "*officers*" of the so-called "*United States District Court*" have also refused to respond in any way whatsoever, is Grievant/Claimant/Crime Victim/PAG David Schied follow-up "*Citation; Complaint; Affidavit; Brief of Information; and Complaint in Commerce for Damages,*" which constitutes an "*Affidavit of Obligation...[and] a Security representing an 'Accounts Receivable' [Ledger]*" [and] a "*Lien upon the real and movable property, malpractice insurance, and performance bonds of the... named....debtors...and the 'criminally accused'.*" (See the document listed herein as "**EXHIBIT #15,**" and found online in the Article III (lower) Court of Record at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/100416\\_WritofErrorCoramNobisContemptClaimsInCommerce/](http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/100416_WritofErrorCoramNobisContemptClaimsInCommerce/)

[CoramNobisContemptClaimsInCommerce/Exhibits/EX\\_17\\_AllPersonsListedCrimComplaintInCommerce.pdf](#)

Despite being “*served*” on or about 10/4/16 with individual copies of the same which specifically named each “*person*” on a separate but similar “*Affidavit of Obligation*,” NONE have responded to or even acknowledged the delivery of such a sworn and notarized “*Brief of [Criminal] Information*” and “*Complaint in Commerce for Damages*,” which again, is a *pattern and practice* modeled upon the judges and attorneys of the referenced “*predicate state and federal court cases*” and upon the Sixth Circuit COA’s own actions with regard to the “*Interlocutory Appeal*” and the subsequently-filed “*Quo Warranto Demand...*” Note that all of these separately-addressed copies of “*Affidavit of Obligation*” can be found as delivered to the U.S. Attorney General, to the U.S. Department of Treasury, to the U.S. Department of State, and to all “*chiefs*” of the military branches of UNITED STATES, located at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/101116\\_Information2USMilitary&4th2USAGLynch+15NewDefendantClaimsInCommerce/101016NewDefsClaimsInCommerce/](#)

and as filed (on 10/4/16) and served (again on 10/12/16) against the UNITED STATES itself, located at:

[http://cases.michigan.constitutionalgov.us/david-schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/101216\\_Claim&FOIA2USTreasury&StateDept/UNITEDSTATESComplaintInCommerce.pdf](#)

**CONCLUSION AND ARGUMENT FOR PAG DAVID SCHIED'S  
AND PAG CORNELL SQUIRES' "ORDER FOR RELIEF"  
BEING BY WAY OF THIS INSTANT "ORDER FOR EN BANC REVIEW  
AND ANSWER IN REPORT ON 'QUO WARRANTO'"/>**

As a matter of record, the above-referenced Common Law "ORDER" calls for "*all active judges*" of the bench of the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA to "*issue an appropriate Order*". ("Appropriate," according to the Oxford and other online dictionaries, is defined as "*suitable under the circumstances*," which are outlined herein). The currently-listed "*active judges*" are found in **EXHIBIT #16** as captured from the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA's own web-page on 11/13/16. Thus, in repeat of the instructions commanded in the previous filing of "Quo Warranto' Demand for Proving Jurisdiction, Article III 'Good Behavior' and 'Authentication of Oaths and Bonds' in Light of Prima Facie Evidence Proving That 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit Judges are Fostering 'Domestic Terrorism'...," as purported "*independent*" and "*lifetime employed*" judges under Article III, the "*active judges*" of the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA are hereby commanded:

*"... to provide **within fourteen (14) calendar days** a response to this 'Quo Warranto' demand or resign from your office(s) immediately. Failure to comply with all the demands of this Writ of Quo Warranto will be an admission of your intentional and willful engagement in RICO and HIGH-TREASON against the People, and will be subject to presentments or indictments for immediate removal from office and criminal prosecution for committing of illicit and on-going crimes in a wheel and chain of conspiracy."*

Furthermore, as the "108 Exhibits of Evidence" warrant, the judges of the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit COA are instructed to deliver an Order or series of orders which:



- 1) Set aside all of the fraudulent state and federal rulings referenced by the “Quo Warranto Demand...” as *predicate cases*;
- 2) Order criminal investigations into all state and federal judges and magistrates referenced by the “Quo Warranto Demand...,” including but not limited to even the named judges of the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals;
- 3) Order the immediate payment of \$230 MILLION in gold to David Schied as civil and common law remedy for the claimed damages;
- 4) Order an address of the U.S. District Court “Writ of Error Coram Nobis” as a reinstated case based upon UNREBUTTED sworn and notarized Affidavits and other indisputable Evidence of a long history of “*fraud*” upon the American public and “*fraud upon the court*;”
- 5) Order the “*set aside*” of any supposed “*conviction*” created or disseminated by Karen Khalil, based upon a preponderance of Evidence that David Schied is actually a “*victim*” of *domestic terrorists*, that Khalil lacked any personal or subject-matter jurisdiction, and because the acts of Khalil, *et al* presented a “*state-created danger*” as depicted in the original filing of common law “*trespass*” complaint and “Claim of Damages” warranting \$150 MILLION alone in that underlying case to Grievant/Claimant/PAG David Schied as detailed in that filing.

---

Respectively submitted by,

 David Schied without prejudice

and  
30

 Counsel E. Spence



## CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

The common law “*brief*” as depicted above – as submitted by PAGs David Schied and Cornell Squires on their own behalves, as contracted “*Next Friend(s)*” to at least 14 “*Joinder Claimants,*” and acting in the Public Interest as Private Attorney Generals in both civil and criminal remedies against alleged “*domestic terrorists*” – is hereby “*certified*” as falling within the guidelines of the F.R.A.P. Rule 28 for briefs not exceeding 30 pages and/or 14,000 words.

In fact, the “*body*” of this filing, as the “*principal brief*” is 30 pages and contains 7,379 words.

Submitted by,



David Schied without prejudice