

21 - 6729

UNDER ARTICLE III
IN SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

David Schied, one of the *Sovereign* American People
recognized by the U.S. CONSTITUTION;
a totally and permanently disabled *RECENT*
QUAD-AMPUTEE, CRIME VICTIM,
Common Law and Civil Rights *sui juris*
GRIEVANT / CLAIMANT / BENEFICIARY
"BENEFICIARY - RELATOR"


v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et alia*

recognized now widely as a "*Federal Corporation*" masquerading as an Administrative ("*Fourth Branch*") State and ARTICLE III "*constitutional*" fixture "*of, by and for The American People*"

"CO-TRUSTEES"

ORIGINAL



PETITION ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Court of Appeals
21-2809
Jane Kelly, David Stras, Jonathan Kobes

USDC-SDWD
Civ. No. 21-5030
JUDGE: Lawrence Piersol

A Case Inextricably Intertwined With:

*David Schied v. U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, INC., *et alia**
EIGHTH CIRCUIT COA CASE # 21-2873; USDC-SDWD case #21-5035

Sui-Juris

DISABLED / BENEFICIARY
David Schied – *RELATOR*
P.O. Box 321
SPEARFISH, S. DAKOTA
57783
605-580-5121 (all calls)

vs

Representing All of the CO-TRUSTEES

Lawrence Piersol and Matthew Thelen; *acting* as the latest in a long line of "UNITED STATES" *principles* and *agents* usurping the Powers otherwise "Reserved to the States respectively", and/or "Retained by the [Sovereign] People".

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Are U.S. Courts and the SUPREME COURT really operating as "ARTICLE III" under the U.S. CONSTITUTION, or are they operating under the CONSTITUTION of the UNITED NATIONS' "INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF JUDGES" through unified FEDERAL JUDGES ASSOCIATION membership to the IAJ via UNITED STATES judges' membership in the FJA? Either way, can U.S. judges continue to treat repeated "*crime victim*" Reports about an "*attempted murder*", and "*whistleblower*" Statements about criminal coverups by "*government servants*" of the EXECUTIVE and JUDICIAL branches in "*backward-looking access-to-court*" cases, "with blanket immunity" for "*the Accused*" and "without providing any meaningful investigation whatsoever" into any of the CIVIL claims and CRIMINAL allegations? If so, how is this so, when both JUDICIAL and EXECUTIVE officers have OATHS OF RESPONSIBILITY and FIDUCIARY DUTIES, and are being paid by American "*Taxpayers*" to act with accountability to address FACTS, EVIDENCE, and CLAIMS against their failures to act constitutionally and in accordance with the Public Trust?
2. Notwithstanding Affidavit(s) of Truth concerning the FACTS, EVIDENCE and CLAIMS of #1 above, **is not a proclaimed "long time target" of government retaliation** and an attempted murder resulting in amputations of both legs and all but a single pinky finger on a non-dominant hand – being one who continues to be targeted to such extent as to being thereafter criminally EVICTED WITHOUT DUE PROCESS during the deathly cold of a Michigan winter, during a COVID

PANDEMIC, and during an EVICTION MORATORIUM – entitled to proper "access" to the UNITED STATES courts after finding refuge from homelessness as a bona fide "REFUGEE," and once settled in another State? If not, why not given the conditions of #1 above concerning OATHS and DUTIES?

3. Notwithstanding a plethora of Affidavit(s) of Truth(s) concerning the FACTS, EVIDENCE and CLAIMS of both #1 and #2 above, **is not Certiorari warranted** when UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT "*judge/s*" assigned to the case(s) have written a *prima facie* fraudulent "*judgment/s*" and other convoluted and erroneous documents that not only DISMISSES the entire case(s), but also goes so far as to summarily deny a "*forma pauperis*" and "*recently totally and permanently disabled quad-amputee*" any "access" whatsoever to the "Electronic [EM/ECF] Filing System", and similarly denying all requested formal "*Service of Process*" by the U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE upon the named CO-TRUSTEES/RESPONDANTS to the captioned case(s); and thus, COMPLETELY DENIES ACCESS to a sovereign America man deemed otherwise protected from such disparaging and unequal treatment under the U.S. CONSTITUTION, Human Rights Laws, and Civil Rights Laws designed to protect and provide "*equal treatment*" to the "*disabled*", the "*poor*", and the "*elderly*", as BENEFICIARY-RELATOR David Schied is one of the Sovereign American People and as a former "*Taxpayer*"? If not, why not when JUDICIAL officers have OATHS OF RESPONSIBILITY and FIDUCIARY DUTIES to act with accountability while providing due process and court access in accordance with the Public Trust?

4. Notwithstanding EVIDENCE of all three numbered "Truths" listed above, is not Certiorari warranted when a TRIBUNAL of UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS (8th Cir.) "judges" has summarily upheld the lower District Court's *fraudulence* with only three sentences of unexplained concurrence in dismissing the case without due process, without providing the "*whistleblower*" against government and alleged criminal perpetrators with "*meaningful access*", and without the named CO-TRUSTEES/RESPONDANTS being provided their day in Court to defend the civil CLAIMS and formal CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS against them as otherwise required by law governing "*speedy trials*"? If not, why not when ... (as stated above)?

PARTIES NAMED and JUDGMENTS TO BE REVIEWED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

No: 21-2809

David Schied, one of the Sovereign American People, a totally and permanently disabled RECENT QUAD-AMPUTEE, CRIME VICTIM, Common Law and Civil Rights *sui juris* GRIEVANT/CLAIMANT/BENEFICIARY (BENEFICIARY/RELATOR)

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

United States of America; Donald Trump, in his public capacity as former U.S. PRESIDENT for the UNITED STATES; Denise Paige Hood, in her private capacity and public capacity as "chief judge" for the USDCEDM; Victoria Roberts, in her private capacity and public capacity as "senior judge" for the USDCEDM; Avern Cohn, in her private capacity and public capacity as "senior judge" for the USDCEDM; U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, also known as USDCEDM; Kinikia Essix, in her private capacity and public capacity as "Clerk of the Court" for the USDCEDM; Office of the U.S. Attorney for the EDM; Matthew Schneider, in his private capacity and public capacity as former ASSISTANT AG for the STATE OF MICHIGAN and as U.S. ATTORNEY for the EDM; Barbara McQuade, in her private capacity and public capacity as former U.S. ATTORNEY for the EDM; Terrence Berg, in his private capacity and public capacity as former U.S. ATTORNEY and as U.S. District Court "judge" for the EDM; Stephen Joseph Murphy, in his private capacity and public capacity as former U.S. ATTORNEY and as U.S. District Court "judge" for the EDM; Michael Horowitz, in his private and public capacities, as USDOJ-OIG and CHAIR of PANDEMIC RESPONSE ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE, a DIVISION of the COUNCIL OF INSPECTORS GENERAL ON INTEGRITY AND EFFICIENCY; Nina Witkofski, in her private capacity, and in her public capacity as CHIEF OF STAFF, for the CENTER FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION; William P. Barr, in his private capacity, and in his public capacity as former U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL ("USAG"); Jeffrey A. Rosen, in his public capacity as former USAG; Merrick B. Garland, in his public capacity as USAG; Eric Dreiband, in his private capacity, and in his public capacity as former ASST. U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL for the CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION of the U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ("USDOJ"); Christopher Cole, in his private capacity as the "criminally accused" and in his public capacity as USDOJ FBI Task Force Officer; Christopher Tarrant, in his private capacity as the "criminally accused" and in his public capacity as USDOJ FBI Special Agent; Ben Carson, in his private capacity and public capacity as former SECRETARY for the U.S. HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ("HUD"); Rae Oliver Davis, in her private capacity, and in her public capacity as INSPECTOR GENERAL for HUD; David Montoya, in his private capacity, and in his public capacity as INVESTIGATOR for the OFFICE OF INVESTIGATION of the HUD OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL; Christi Grimm, in her private capacity, and in her public capacity as PRINCIPAL DEPUTY INSPECTOR GENERAL of the UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES; Seema Verma, in her private capacity, and in her public capacity as DIRECTOR of the CENTER FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID SERVICES ("CMS") of USDHHS; Andrew Saul, in his private and public capacities as COMMISSIONER for the SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION; Sonny Purdue, in his private capacity, and in his

public capacity as SECRETARY of the U.S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE; Devon Westhill, in his private capacity, and in his public capacity as DEPUTY of the OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS for the UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE; Roberto Contreras, in his private and public capacities; DIRECTOR, CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION of the UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE; Betsy DeVos, in her private capacity, and in her public capacity as former SECRETARY for UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION; Steven T. Mnuchin, in his private capacity, and his public capacity as former SECRETARY of UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY; Eugene Scalia, in his private capacity, and his public capacity as former SECRETARY for the UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR ("USDL"); State of Michigan; Gretchen Whitmer, in her private and public capacities as MICHIGAN GOVERNOR; Rick Snyder, in his private and public capacities as former MICHIGAN GOVERNOR; Jennifer Granholm, in her private and public capacities as former MICHIGAN GOVERNOR; Dana Nessel, in her private and public capacities as MICHIGAN ATTORNEY GENERAL; Bill Schuette, in his private and public capacities as former MICHIGAN AG; Michael Cox, in his private and public capacities as former MICHIGAN ASSISTANT AG; Richard Cunningham, in his private and public capacities as former ASSISTANT AG; Charter County of Wayne, a countywide crime syndicate, domestic terrorist network operating as a continuing financial crimes enterprise; State Bar of Michigan; Travis Reeds, in his private capacity and public capacity as "judge" for the 52-1 DISTRICT COURT OF MICHIGAN, operating as a continuing financial crimes enterprise; Attorney Grievance Commission; Dominic Sylvestri, in his private capacity, and in his public capacity as a MICHIGAN "officer of the court" for the "52-1 JUDICIAL DISTRICT" of the STATE OF MICHIGAN; Ava K. Ortner, in her private capacity as the Criminally "Accused" and as an "eviction" attorney; Ava K. Ortner, in her public capacity as a MICHIGAN "officer of the court" and as LEGAL GUARDIAN FOR Donald Thorpe, Jr., a disabled veteran and the Criminally "Accused"; Donald Thorpe, Jr., a disabled veteran and the Criminally "Accused"; Kevin Skully, in his capacities as "ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE" for the MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS, MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT, GREAT LAKES AND ENERGY; Sally Talberg, Chairman of the MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION; Jerry Labut, in his private capacity as former AMI PROJECT MANAGER for DTE ENERGY; Beverly Buritz, in her private capacity as OPERATIONS SUPERVISOR for DTE ENERGY; DTE Energy; Bill Gatt, in his private capacity and his public capacity as MAYOR of the CITY OF NOVI; Novi City Council; Paul Gobeille, in his private capacity, and in his CORPORATE capacity as SENIOR VICE-PRESIDENT for COLLIER'S INTERNATIONAL; Michael Yamada, in his private capacity, and in his CORPORATE capacity as PRINCIPAL for COLLIER'S INTERNATIONAL; Colliers International; Everett Stern, in his private and CORPORATE capacities as "Intelligence Director" as TACTICAL RABBIT, a private CORPORATION; Tom Masseau, in his private capacity, and in his CORPORATE capacity as former Director of MICHIGAN PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY SERVICE ("MPAS" NOW "DISABILITY RIGHTS MICHIGAN") and PRESIDENT for NATIONAL DISABILITY RIGHTS NETWORK; Robin Jones, in her private capacity, and in her CORPORATE capacity as DIRECTOR; Peter Berg, in his private capacity, and in his CORPORATE capacity as TECHNICAL AND PROJECT COORDINATOR for the GREAT LAKES ADA CENTER at the INSTITUTE ON DISABILITY AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT at the UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS; University of Illinois; Susan Fitzmaurice, in her private capacity, and in her CORPORATE capacity as CO-FOUNDER of MICHIGAN ADA 30th ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION and, CO-FOUNDER of IDEAAS-SUSAN FITZMAURICE and TEDDY'S TS AND BUTTONS; Lora Frankel, in her private capacity, and in her CORPORATE capacity as CO-FOUNDER of MICHIGAN ADA 30th ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION and VSA MICHIGAN; Christopher Fitzmaurice, in his CORPORATE and PRINCIPAL of IDEAAS-SUSAN FITZMAURICE and TEDDY'S TS AND BUTTONS; Trans Union, LLC, a credit

reporting CORPORATION; Equifax Information Services LLC, a credit reporting CORPORATION; Experian Information Solutions, a credit reporting CORPORATION; Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency, a quasi-governmental student originator, servicer, and debt collector operating as the CORPORATE FICTION of "FEDLOAN SERVICING", also known as PHEAA; Nelnet, Inc., a student loan servicing CORPORATION; Educational Credit Management Corporation, a student loan guarantor CORPORATION, also known as ECMC; Richard Fairbank, in his private and his CORPORATE capacity as FOUNDER/CHAIRMAN/PRESIDENT/CEO of CAPITAL ONE FINANCIAL CORPORATION; Capital One Financial Corporation, an INACTIVE credit card, credit extension and debt collection CORPORATION otherwise doing business fraudulently and in the STATE OF MICHIGAN in discriminatory and predatory fashion in 2020 and 2021; Jane and John Does, 1-30 (as may be named in subsequent "amended" filings)

Defendants - Appellees

Appeal from U.S. District Court for the District of South Dakota - Western
(5:21-cv-05030-LLP)

JUDGMENT

Before KELLY, STRAS, and KOBES, Circuit Judges.

The judgment of the district court dismissing the action is summarily affirmed. See Eighth Circuit Rule 47A(a). The case is remanded to the district court with instructions to unseal the records in this case to the extent feasible.

October 06, 2021

Order Entered at the Direction of the Court:
Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit.

/s/ Michael E. Gans

PRIMA FACIE FRAUDULENT DISTRICT COURT "JUDGMENT"

Case 5:21-cv-05030-LLP *SEALED* Document 15 Filed 07/29/21 Page 1 of 1 PageID #: 846

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA
WESTERN DIVISION

* DAVID SCHIED,
* CIV 21-5030
* Plaintiff,
*
* vs.
* DEPOSITORS INSURANCE COMPANY,
* et al.,
* Defendants.
*

JUDGMENT

DEPOSITORS INSURANCE COMPANY,
et al.,


Defendants.

In accordance with the Order filed on this date with the Clerk granting Plaintiff's Motion to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and 28 U.S.C. § 1915 screening for dismissal,

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that the case is dismissed in its entirety in favor of Defendants and against Plaintiff, and as stated in the Court's Order on this date, where the dismissal is based on immunity, the dismissal is with prejudice and for the remaining claims and Defendants, the dismissal is without prejudice.


Dated this 28th day of July, 2021.

BY THE COURT:



Lawrence L. Piersol
United States District Judge

ATTEST:
MATTHEW W. THELEN, CLERK



REVISED CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Pursuant to SCOTUS Rule 29.6, BENEFICIARY/RELATOR David Schied, as well as all others “*similarly situated*” by “*backward-looking-access-to-court*” cases being presented by BENEFICIARY/RELATOR acting in the capacity of a “*Private, Public Proxy*” in COMMON LAW – which is akin to working in the capacity of a “*Private Attorney General*” in the “*statutory*” realm – herein certify that he/they are all natural persons being presented (not “represented”) with a “*sovereign*” status as “*We, The [American] People*”, the posterity of those “*Founding Fathers*” who created and/or established and ordained the original, “*organic*” Constitution for the United States of America.

On the other hand, those designated as “**CO-TRUSTEES**” by this case – though many are named and being sued in their “*private*” capacities as natural persons – are named in this case in their “*public*” capacities as well. As such, virtually every one of these CO-TRUSTEES are neither operating under the Common Law nor under “*Constitutional*” forms of governments; but are actually instead being disclosed herein as illegitimate FEDERAL and STATE CORPORATIONS otherwise masquerading as legitimate “*fiduciary government servants*” through various forms of meaningless rhetoric and the dumbing down of the American “*body politic*” through propagandizing and outright FRAUD, SEDITION, and TREASON. This they do using unconstitutional applications of the “*codified*” and “*statutory*” systems, along with the misuse and misapplication of “*administrative procedures*”, in gross violation of both the “*letter*” and the “*spirit*” of the RULES ENABLING ACT. Thus, even those named CO-TRUSTEES that are licensed “*officers*” and “*franchises*” of these FEDERAL and

STATE “*governments*” are also being “*disclosed*” herein as “**UNINSURED CORPORATIONS**”, pursuant to SCOTUS Rule 29.6.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Questions Presented for Review	ii
Parties Named and Judgments to be Reviewed	v
Revised Corporate Disclosure Statement	ix
Table of Cited Authorities	xiii
Citations of Official and Unofficial Reports of the Opinions and Orders Entered in the Five (5) Listed Backward-Looking Access-to-Court Cases by the SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES (“SCOTUS”)	xv
Citations Officially Entered by Beneficiary/Relator’s Own ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD under the Common Law	xvii
Common Law Maxims	xix
Other Citations in the Case Record	xx
Previously Cited Authorities in the Case Record	xxi
Previously Cited “ <i>Backward-Looking Access-to-Court Cases</i> ” Left Unresolved Except by Fraud Upon the Court	xxiv
More Previously Cited Authorities in the Case Record	xxv
Citations Entered Into the Case by Lawrence Piersol’s Own Unconstitutional “INTERNATIONAL JUDGE’S ASSOCIATION” Court Operating in the USDC-SD Through Membership in the “ <i>FEDERAL JUDGES ASSOCIATION</i> ”	xxvii
Citations of Judicial and Court Obligations	xxviii
Dismissal of Case as “ <i>Frivolous</i> ”, “ <i>Failure to State a Claim</i> ”, and “ <i>Immunity</i> ” – Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i-ii) and 28 U.S.C. § 191(e)(2)(B)(i-ii)	xxviii

Statement of the Case	1
All of "The Accused" Judges Are Members of the FJA; and the FJA is – as a Matter of Fact – a Member of the IAJ Operating Under an Entirely "Foreign" Constitution, and Headquartered in Rome, Italy Under a Known Communist Regime	19
Federal Judges Association – Current Members by Circuit	20
Universal Charter of the Judge	20
Federal Judges Association – Officers and Board Directors	21
Argument	24
Courts are Bound to "The Constitution" as the "Supreme" Law and America's "Declaration of independence" is the Indelible Reminder That When There is a "Long Train of Abuses and Usurpations" by Government, the People Have Both Right and Obligation to "Alter or Abolish" That Government, So to Re-Secure the Inalienable Rights of the American People	25
The U.S. CONSTITUTION Guarantees That the Fundamental Principles of the "Natural Rights of Man" are Inalienable; and That the Sovereign "States" Stay United by Unbreakable COMPACT to Guarantee That All Governments of These "United States of America" are Operating In Accord With the Sole Purpose of "Securing" These Natural and Inalienable "Rights of the People" – Equally – to Each and Every Individual	28
Creating a False Narrative For Implementing "Critical Race Theory" and Marxist Ideology of Racial and Gender "Equity" Against a Perceived "Privileged White Male" is an Abuse of Authority, Even as They are Carried Out Summarily by Judges to Promote "Fictional", Unconstitutional, and "Foreign" Principles of "Social Justice" as Substitutes for "Litigation of the Merits" Based Upon "Real" Jury Trials and Grand Jury Indictments Where Government CORPORATIONS are "The Accused"	29
Those "BAR-Member Attorneys-Turned-Judges" Who Operate in America Under Influence of the British "INNS OF THE COURT", and Who Likewise Follow a Very Different "CONSTITUTION" as Well as	

the “ <i>Foreign Policies</i> ” of the of the UNITED NATIONS – With the “ <i>FEDERAL JUDGES ASSOCIATION</i> Membership to the “ <i>INTERNATIONAL JUDGES ASSOCIATION</i> – at Least Exude the “ <i>Appearance of Bad Behavior</i> ” and <i>Criminal Violation</i> of the FOREIGN AGENT REGISTRATION ACT (“FARA”) of 1938	30
The <i>UNDELEGATED</i> Display of Power From Federal Judges Upholding Prosecutorial Abuses of Discretion – Whether at the STATE or UNITED STATES Levels – Erodes Legislative Power, Violates the CONSTITUTIONAL “ <i>Separation of Powers</i> ”, and Usurps the Sovereign Power and Responsibility of the STATES to NULLIFY Government Acts That Are Incongruent and Inconsistent With the “ <i>Enunciated Duties</i> ” Delegated by the States to the EXECUTIVE BRANCH to “ <i>Take Care</i> <i>That the Laws [are] Faithfully Executed</i> ”	32
True “ <i>Consent of the Governed</i> ” is Measured by “ <i>the Peoples</i> ” Obedience and Silence in Response to “ <i>Just</i> ” Power of Government; It is Not Based Merely Upon the Measure of Government “ <i>Status</i> ” and “ <i>Discretionary</i> ” Decision-Making Leaving Openings So Wide for Abuses That Truckloads of “ <i>Recorded</i> ” Criminal Activities Can Be Driven Through With “ <i>Immunity</i> ” Against Private and Public Claims of There Having Been Harm to “ <i>the People</i> ”	34
Conclusion	36
Verification	40

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

	<i>Page</i>
<u>FEDERAL</u>	
18 U.S.C. §225 (<i>Continuing Financial Crimes Enterprises</i>)	3
18 U.S.C. §1113 (<i>Attempted Murder</i>)	ii, xxxiv, 1-2, 14
18 U.S.C. 2331(5) (<i>Domestic Terrorism</i>)	
xv, xvii, xxvix, xxxi, xxxvi-xxxix, 1, 4, 11, 13, 16, 20, 29, 31, 37	
18 U.S.C. § 2383 (<i>Insurrection</i>)	xv, xxix, xxxi, xxxvi-vli, 1, 4, 13, 16, 20, 29, 31, 37
18 U.S.C. Chapter 115 – Treason, Sedition, and Subversive Activities	
ix, xv, xvii, xxii, xxix, xxxi, xxxvi-xl, 13, 29, 31-	
34	
<i>Arizona v. United States</i> , 132 S.Ct. 2492 (2012) (Scalia, J. dissenting)	35
<i>Carol Anne Bond v. UNITED STATES</i> , 564 U.S. 211 (2011)	28, 31
<i>D&G, Inc. v. C&S Wholesale Grocers, Inc. (In re Wholesale Grocery Prods.</i> (Antitrust Litig.) also <i>versus SuperValu, Inc.</i> (Eighth Circuit)	
Case # 18-2121 initiated in 2003	21
<i>David Schied v. Karen Khalil, and the CHARTER COUNTY OF WAYNE, ET AL</i>	
This federal case was referenced by Lawrence Poersol (Doc. #14, p.13; Page ID #820) as <i>Schied v. Khalil</i> , 2016 WL 4727477 (E.D. MI. 2016) and <i>Schied v. Khalil</i> , (R&R) 2016 WL 11472341 (E.D. MI. 2016)	31
<i>David Schied v. Martha Daughtrey; David McKeague; Gregory Tatenhove; Stephen Murphy; Terrence Berg; Rod Charles; Andrew Arena; Margaret Love; Michael Mukasey; Maria O'Rourke; and Shanetta Cutlar</i>) as cited by Lawrence Piersol, also in Doc.14, p.13, Page ID #820, as “ <i>Schied v. Daughtrey</i> , 2008 WL 5422680 (E.D. MI. 2008); <i>Schied v. Daughtrey</i> , 2009 WL 818095 (E.D. MI. 2009); <i>Schied v. Daughtrey</i> , 2009 WL 369484 (E.D. MI. 2009)	14
<i>David Schied v. MIDLAND COUNTY SHERIFF Gerald Nielson</i> , 571 U.S. 846 (2013) – Doc. #14; page 17 (Page ID#824) of the USDC record. SCOTUS Case #12-10356	11

David Schied v. Scott Snyder, Lynn Mossoian, Kenneth Roth, Richard Fanning, Jr., David Soebbing, Harvalee Saunto, Donna Paruszkiewicz, Mary Fayad, Susan Liebetreu, Donald Yarab, Catherine Anderle, Arne Duncan, in both their individual and official capacities,
565 U.S. 982 (2011) – SCOTUS Case #11-6015

6

David Schied v. Ronald Ward, Ken Hamman, Kirk Hobson, Patricia Meyer, Karen Ellsworth, Jessica Murray, Jennifer Bouhana, Patricia Ham, Joe Mosier, in both their individual and official capacities,
565 U.S. 1231 (2012) – Doc. #14; page 17 (Page ID#824) of the USDC record.
SCOTUS Case #11-5937

6

Doctrine of *Backward-Looking Access-To-Court* cases [e.g., Christopher v. Harbury, 534 U.S. 1064 (2002)]
xv, xxiv, xxxii, xxxv, xxxvii, xxxix, xl, 1, 11-14, 24, 29, 31, 34, 38

Enforcement Discretion and Executive Duty, 67 Vanderbilt Law Review 671
(2014) by Zachary S. Price

36

Enforcing the President's Constitutional Duty to Faithfully Execute the Laws Before the H. Comm. on the Judiciary, 113th Cong. 2 (2014) (statement of Rep. Goodlatte, Chairman, H. Comm. on the Judiciary)

35

Federally legislated Eviction Moratorium (Executive Order 13945
of August 8, 2020) iii, xx. xxxii, xxxiv, xli, 1-3, 13-14

Gamut Control, LLC, John McCormic, John Golfis v. Susan Rydberg, Giorgio Tuscani, David Schied (filed by Gregory Abbott)
Case #09-cv-00913

21

In Re David Schied, SCOTUS Case #11-5945

7

Rules Enabling Act.....ix, xviii, xxi, xxv-xxvii

U.S. Constitution (a.k.a. “*Great Compact*”; “*Public Trust*”)
i-iii, ix-xii, xiv, xviii-xx, xxxix, xl, 17, 26, 28, 32-35, 37

U.S. Constitution, Article III
i-ii, x, xv, xvii, xxii, xxix, xxxi-xxxiv, xxxvi-xl, 4-5, 7-8, 14-16, 18, 24-27, 34, 38

U.S. Constitution, Ninth Amendment

xxii, xxxiii, 17, 31

U.S. Constitution, “*Take Care Clause*” (ART. II, § 3)

35

U.S. Constitution, Tenth Amendment	xxxiii, xl, 17, 28, 31
Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions (against the <i>Alien and Sedition Act</i>) (1798)	32

COMMON LAW / AMICUS CURIAE / MAXIMS / LEGAL LITERATURE

<i>Amicus in Treatise: Interpreting the Unconstitutional History of Federal And National Governance of the Patriotic “People” and Other “Free Persons” Inhabiting the United States</i>	26
Common Law i, ix, xvii, xix, xx-xxi, xxxii, xxxvii-xxxviii, 4-5. 13. 17, 25-26, 28, 39	
<i>Dream On: The Obama Administration’s Nonenforcement of Immigration Laws, The DREAM Act, and the Take Care Clause</i> , 91 Tex. L. Rev. 781, 781-83 (2013) by Robert J. Delahunty & John C. Yoo	35
<i>How and Why the Courts and Other ‘Branches’ of American Governance Got So Corrupted and Appear to Ignore the Constitutional Guarantees of the ‘Public Trust’</i>	27
International Association of Judges “Constitution” – Article III – “Statutes”	22

CITATIONS OF OFFICIAL AND UNOFFICIAL REPORTS OF THE OPINIONS AND ORDERS ENTERED IN THE FIVE (5) LISTED BACKWARD-LOOKING ACCESS-TO-COURT CASES BY THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES (“SCOTUS”) (The ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD associated with the official filings and decisions entered in the cases listed below are all located at the following link: http://www.ricobusters.com/?page_id=818)

- 1) IN RE SCHIED (2011) (SCOTUS Case# 11-5945) – This PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS was rooted in the repeated *denial of access* to a grand jury for reporting the STATE OF MICHIGAN “judges” and STATE BAR OF MICHIGAN “attorneys” — being at the base cause behind the total destruction of an American (Schied) family and a resulting “*divorce and child custody*” case stemming from Sedition, Treason, Insurrection, and Domestic Terrorism being reported as covering a span of eight years and onward to the present as none of these issues were ever “*litigated on the merits*”, thus denying “*meaningful access to the court*” in the underlying numerous cases in which the “*DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL*” and “*DEMAND FOR GRAND JURY*” were both MANDAMUS DENIED by SCOTUS.

<http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/103111-SCOTUSdenialofWRITOFMANDAMUS.pdf>

2) David Schied (on behalf of STUDENT A) v. Scott Snyder, ET AL (2011) (SCOTUS Case No. 11-6015): PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI – The underlying cause of this action begged answering of the question of “*Who can a Sovereign American ‘citizen’ go to when reporting CRIMES by ‘sworn’ government officials when these government servants to the People’ refuse to even acknowledge the EVIDENCE of the crimes, much less adjudicate or prosecute them against one another; and when both the ‘Judicial’ and ‘Executive’ branches of government refuse to provide ACCESS to the REAL ‘government of, by, and for the People’ by way of helping One of the People to reach a JURY and/or GRAND JURY for issuing ‘final’ decisions in these matters after ‘hearing’ sworn testimonies and evidence?*” as CERTIORARI DENIED by SCOTUS.

http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/103111_CertiorariDENIED11-6015-Snyderetal-StudentA.pdf

3) David Schied v. Ronald Ward, ET AL (2011) (SCOTUS Case No. 11-5937): PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI – This case has still to be uploaded as stored in boxes and thus far inaccessible due to recent criminal victimization associated directly with this instant 2021 case before SCOTUS.

4) David Schied v. MIDLAND COUNTY SHERIFF Gerald Nielson, et al (2012) (SCOTUS Case No. 12-10356): PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI – The spelling went from “*Gerald Nielson*” (as originally filed in the lower “*U.S. DISTRICT COURT*”) to “*Jerry Nelson*” (as “*DENIED*” by EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN “*Chief Judge*” Denise Page Hood) by means of a criminal conspiracy between this *judicial usurper* and *Clerk of the Court* to commit an *OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE* while tainting the official record to provide *comfort and safe harbor* to the MIDLAND COUNTY SHERIFF Gerald Nielson by hiding his actual name from all future court records. Notably, Gerald Nielson “*retired*” from his Office just after this case was initially filed, at the end of 2012. Importantly, at each successive level of “*APPEAL*” to the SIXTH CIRCUIT and to the U.S. SUPREME COURT, whereby I (David Schied) attempted to “*correct the record*” by spelling “*Gerald Nielson*” correctly on my cover sheets, the “*clerks*” as “*secondary*” level “*RICO*” racketeers changed the name back fraudulently to “*Jerry Nelson*” to uphold the “*predicate*” RICO CRIMES OF FRAUD committed by Denise Page Hood and her criminal accomplices of her “*lower court*” DOMESTIC TERRORIST NETWORK.

The original DENIAL notice from the SCOTUS clerk is yet to be located in stored boxes due to recent criminal victimization associated directly with this instant 2021 case before SCOTUS. However, EVIDENCE of the fact that there was a “*Petition for Writ of Certiorari*” case number assigned by SCOTUS – along with my “*CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE*” (dated 5/20/13) as delivered to

SCOTUS – should suffice as “*self-evident*” DENIAL of this case by SCOTUS after it was accepted as legitimately “*filed*” as located at:

<http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/4-SCOTUS-CERTIORARISchedule-p25-SchiedKrausvGeraldNielson-12-10356.pdf>

and at:

<http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/3-SchiedKrausvGeraldNielson-CERTOFSERVNOTOFAPPEAL-I-12-10356.pdf>

CITATIONS OFFICIALLY ENTERED BY BENEFICIARY/RELATOR'S OWN ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD UNDER THE COMMON LAW

FEDERAL

18 U.S.C. § 4 (“*Misprision of Felony*”)

18 U.S.C. § 225 (“*Continuing Financial Crimes Enterprise*”)

18 U.S.C. §§241-242 (“*[Conspiracy to] Deprive of Rights*”)

18 U.S.C. §1961-1968 (“*RICO*”)

18 U.S.C. § 2331(5) (“*Domestic Terrorism*” defined)

18 U.S.C. § 2381 (“*Treason*”)

18 U.S.C. § 3771 (“*Crime Victims' Rights*”)

28 U.S.C. § 1346(b)

28 U.S.C. § 1654

28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)

28 U.S.C. § 2676

42 U.S.C. §1983

4 CFR § 22.6

32 CFR § 750.23

Americans With Disabilities Act

Bill of Rights (U.S. Constitution)

Bowsher v. Syner, 478 U.S. 714, 721 (1986)

Buckley v. Valeo, 42 U.S. 1, 438 (1976) (*per curiam*)

Data Disc, Inc. v. Systems Tech. Assocs., Inc. 557 F.2d 1280 (9th Cir. 1977)

Declaration of Independence

False Claims Act

Faretta v. California, 45 L Ed 2d 562, 592 (1975)

Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure (“FRAP”), Rule #31(a)(1)

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP) Rule 56(c)(4), 56(d),(e), and (f)

First Amendment (U.S. Constitution)

Heckler v. Cheney, 470 U.S. 821, 832 (1985)

INS v. Chadha, 462 U.S. 919, 951 (1983)

Jackson v. Metropolitan Edison Co., 419 U.S. 345 (1974)

John Robertson, Petitioner v. UNITED STATES, Ex Rel. Wykenna Watson,
60 U. S. ____ (2010) No. 08-6261 as “*Brief for the UNITED STATES as
AMICUS CURIAE supporting Respondent*”

Rules Enabling Act

Schied v. DEPOSITOR’S INSURANCE COMPANY, ET AL (Piersol FRAUD)

Schied v. Khalil, 2016 WL 4727477 (E.D. MI)

Schied v. Khalil, (R&R) 2016 WL 11472341

Schied v; Khalid, 2016 WL 4727477, n. 3 (figment of Piersol’s imagination)

Schied ex rel. Student A v. Snyder, 2010 WL 331713 *2 (E.D. MI)

Schied v. Snyder, 565 U.S. 982 (2011)

Schied v. U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, et al (2021)

Seventh Amendment (U.S. Constitution)

Tort Claims (Act)

United States Constitution, Article II, § 3

United States v. Nixon, 418, U.S. 683, 693 (1974)

United States v. Smyth, 104 F.Supp. 283 (1952)

United States v. Throckmorton, 98 U.S. 61 25 L.Ed. 93

United States v. Williams, 504 U.S. 36 (1992)

United Tech Corp. v. Mazer, 556 F. 3d 1260 (11th Cir. 2009)

White v. FCI, USA, Inc., 319, F. 3d 672 (5th Cir. 2003)

STATE

Cochran v. Sess, 372, 61 N.E. 639

Herman v. City of Buffalo, et al 108 N.E. 451 (N.Y. 1915)

New York Supplement (Vol. 143) (New York State Reporter, Vol 177) containing the decisions of the Supreme and Lower Courts of Record of New York State

Common Law MAXIMS

“*An Unrebutted Affidavit Stands as Truth in Commerce*”

“*Fraud vitiates everything*”

“*He who bears the burden ought also to derive the benefit*”

“*He who does not deny, admits*”

“*He who does not repel a wrong when he can, occasions it*”

“*He Who Leaves the Battlefield First Loses by Default*”

“*In Commerce, Truth is Sovereign*”

“Justice delayed is Justice denied”

“Truth is Expressed in the Form of an Affidavit”

Other Citations in the Case Record

A Treatise on the Law of Injunctions (4th ed. 1905) by James L. High

AMICUS IN TREATISE: Interpreting the Unconstitutional History of Federal and National Governance of the Patriotic ‘People’ and Other ‘Free Persons’ Inhabiting the United States’ (313 pages)

Commentaries. William Blackstone

COMMON LAW ‘WRIT OF ERROR CORAM NOBIS’ IN OPPOSITION TO PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE OF ‘CRIMINAL FRAUD AND CONSPIRACY TO DEPRIVE OF RIGHTS’ INVOLVING ‘JUDICIAL USURPERS’ AND ‘CLERKS OF THE COURTS’ AS ‘AGENTS’ OF THE NAMED ‘CO-TRUSTEES’ OF THE CASE CAPTIONED ABOVE’; [with]

FINDING OF CONTEMPT AND “CERTIFICATION OF FAULT/DEFAULT WITH ‘DEFAULT JUDGMENT’ AND COMMON LAW LEDGER OF [TREBLE] DAMAGES; [and with]

‘NOTICE OF ‘CLAIM OF APPEAL’ FOR THE REASONS CITED ABOVE AND BASED UPON ‘OVERRIDING AND PALPABLE ERRORS’ AND GROSS OMISSIONS OF FACTS; AND INTENTIONAL [TORTUOUS] VIOLATIONS OF THE ‘RULES ENABLING ACT’

DECLARATION of David Schied (dated 10/15/20) Invoking the ‘Common Law’ Jurisdiction and/or the ‘Federal’ Jurisdiction in Halting Eviction via QUO WARRANTO, Notice of ‘INTENT TO LIEN’, Claims of DISABILITY and ‘MEDICAL FRAILTY’, and ‘To Prevent Further Spread of COVID-19’ (40 pages)

DECLARATION OF TRUTH OF GRIEVANT/CLAIMANT DAVID SCHIED Concerning the Documentation of the Compounding of Racketeering Crimes by State and National Continuing Financial Crimes Organizations” (11/27/17)

From JFK to 9/11: Everything is a Rich Man’s Trick, (video documentary)

The Holy Bible (John 8:32); (Lev. 19:11-13); (Mat. 10:22)

MEMORANDUM OF RIGHTS of (We), “The PEOPLE”: To Assemble; To Local Governance; and To Withdraw Consent Through State and

Federal Jury Nullification, Through Grand Jury Presents, Through Private Prosecutions, and Through Other Executions of Customary Law and The Laws of Commerce" (183 pages)

Sealing Court Records and Proceedings: A Pocket Guide

The Evolving Uniform Commercial Code: From Infancy to Maturity to Old Age. 26 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 691 (1993). McLaughlin, Gerald T

U.C.C. §1-103

Universal Commercial Code

PREVIOUSLY CITED AUTHORITIES IN THE CASE RECORD

FEDERAL

Articles of Confederation

Bill of Rights

Common Law

Constitution (organic) for the united States of America

Constitution of the United States

Declaration of Independence

Magna Carta

Article I of the United States Constitution

Article III of the United States Constitution

Article IV, §1 of the United States Constitution

Article VI, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution

First Amendment of the United States Constitution

Ninth Amendment of the United States Constitution

18 U.S.C. § 4 ("Misprision of felony")

18 U.S.C. § 241

18 U.S.C. § 242

18 U.S.C. § 1512

18 U.S.C. §1028(t) (*Attempt and Conspiracy to commit Fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents, authentication features, and information*)

18 U.S.C. § 1509 ("Obstruction of court orders")

18 U.S.C. §1961 ("Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations")

18 U.S.C. § 2381 ("Treason")

18 U.S.C. §2382 ("Misprision of Treason")

18 U.S.C. § 2384 ("Seditious conspiracy")

18 U.S.C. § 1505 ("Obstructing an official proceedings before department, agency or committee")

18 U.S.C. § 1510 ("Obstruction of criminal investigations")

18 U.S.C. § 1512 ("Tampering with a witness, victim, or informant")

U.S.C. §2331
18 U.S.C. § 3332 ("special grand jury")
28 U.S.C. §1691
42 U.S.C. §1983 ("Civil Action for Deprivation of Rights")
42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2 ("Unlawful Employment Practices")
Act of May 26, 1790
Act of March 27, 1804
Civil Rights Act of 1964
Civil Rights Attorney Fees Award Act of 1976
E-Government Act (2002)
E-Sign Act (2000) Family Support Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-485, October 13, 1988, 102 STAT. 2343)
Individuals With Disabilities in Education Act
Privacy Act of 1974 [5 U.S.C. 552a(i)(l)]
Racketeering Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act ("RICO Act")
28 CFR §50.12
Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2007 (TRIPRA)
Uniform Commercial Code
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 9(b)
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 23
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 23(g)(1)(A)(iv)
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 45(b)(1)
Sixth Circuit Guide to Electronic Filing, 1.8
Sixth Circuit Guide to Electronic Filing, 9.1
Sixth Circuit Guide to Electronic Filing, 9.2
Sixth Circuit Guide to Electronic Filing, 10.1
Sixth Circuit Guide to Electronic Filing, 10.2
Sixth Circuit Guide to Electronic Filing, 13.1
Bradley v. Fisher, 13 Wall. 335, 20 L.Ed. 646 (1872)
Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. (6 Wheat) 264, 404,5 L.Ed 257 (1821)
Ex parte Milligan, 71 U.S. (4 Wall.) 2 (1866)
Lee v. Southern Home Sites Corp., 444 F.2d 143 (5th Cir. 1971)
Newman v. Piggie Park Enterprises, 390 US 400 (1968) (*per curiam*)
Piper v. Pearson, 2 Gray 120
U.S. v. Will, 449 U.S. 200, 216, 101 S.Ct. 471, 66 L.Ed.2d 392, 406 (1980)

MICHIGAN

Constitution of Michigan
Michigan Code of Judicial Conduct
MCL §15.243(l) (Freedom of Information Act)
MCL 18.351-[Crime Victim's Compensation Board (definitions)]
Michigan Revised School Codes
MCL 380.1230
MCL 380.1230(a)
MCL 380.1230(g)

MCL 691.1407
MCL 750.10 (Michigan's Penal Code)
MCL 750.157a (Michigan's Penal Code)
MCL 750.368 (Michigan's Penal Code)
MCL 750.478a (Michigan's Penal Code)
MCL 761.1
MCL 764.1(a)
MCL 764.1(b)
MCL 767.3
MCL 767.60 – (*Larceny and false pretense cases*)
MCL 767.61 – (*indictment for larceny or larceny by conversion; description of instruments*)
MCL 780.623 (Michigan's Set Aside Law)
MCR 7.212 (G)
MCR 2.114(A)
MCR 2.114(C)(1)
MCR 2.116(C)7
MCR 2.118
MCR 2.207
MCR 3.303(A)(1)
MCR 3.303(A)(2)
MCR 3.303(B)
MCR 303(D)
MCR 303(Q)(1)
MCR Rule 6.101 (Rules of the Court)
MCR 7.101(8)(1)(a)
MCR 7.101(c)(1)
MCR 7.101(c)(2)
MCR 7.101(H)(4)
MCR 7.101(H)(5)
MCR 7.204(C)(2)
MCR 8.119(F)
Michigan Court Rules
David Schied v. Brighton Area Schools (No. 10-25106-CD)
David Schied v. Northville Public Schools, et al
David Schied v. Sandra Harris and the Lincoln Consolidated Schools

OTHER STATES

Article 55.03 (Tex. Code of Crim. Proc.)
Article 60.06(b) (of Texas Code of Criminal Procedures)
Texas Attorney General Dan Morales (May 31, 1995) (Opinion DM 349)
Texas Attorney General John Cornyn (July 10, 2001) (Opinion JC-0396)
Texas Code of Criminal Procedure, Title 1, Chapter 55 (pertaining to
"Expunction of Criminal Records")

Tx.C.Crim.Proc., Title 1, Article 55.03(1) ("Effect of Expunction")
Tx.C.Crim.Proc., Title 1, Article 55.04(1) ("Violation of Expunction Order")
Tx.C.Crim.Proc., Title 1, Article 55.04(2) ("Violation of Expunction Order")
Tx.C.Crim.Proc., Title 1, Article 55.04(3) ("Violation of Expunction Order")

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Memorandum of Law (by David Schied)
State Integrity Investigation Results (2012; and 2015), Center for Public Integrity
("Corruption Risk Report Card for Michigan")
U.S. Department of Homeland Security Presidential Directive-J (2004)
Weaver, Justice Elizabeth, "Judicial Deceit: Tyranny and Unnecessary Secrecy
at the Michigan Supreme Court"

PREVIOUSLY CITED "BACKWARD-LOOKING ACCESS-TO-COURT CASES LEFT UNRESOLVED EXCEPT BY FRAUD UPON THE COURT

David Schied v. Martha Daughtry; David McKeague; Gregory Tatenhove; Stephen Murphy; Terrence Berg; Rod Charles; Andrew Arena; Margaret Love; Michael Mukasey; Maria O'Rourke; and Shanetta Cutlar

David Schied v. Leonard Rezmierski; David Bolitho; Katy Doerr Parker; Northville Public Schools Board of Education; Larry Crider; Robert Donaldson; Warren Evans; James Gonzales; James Hines; Maria Miller; Benny Napoleon; Wayne County Prosecutor's Office; Wayne County Sheriff's Department; Kym Worthy; Jane Doe; and John Doe

David Schied v. Northville Public School District

David Schied v. Sandra Harris and Lincoln Consolidated Schools, et al

David Schied v. State of Michigan; Gov. Jennifer Granholm; Kelly Keenan; Michelle Rich; Michigan State Administrative Board; Attorney General Mike Cox; Commissioner Laura Cox; Wayne County Commission; Wayne County Office of the Prosecutor; Michigan State Police; Northville City Police; Michigan Department of Civil Rights; Michigan Dept. of Education; Wayne County RESA; Northville Public Schools Board of Education; Scott Snyder; Katy Parker; David Bolitho; Leonard Rezmierski; Keller Thoma law firm; Sandra Harris; Lincoln Consolidated Schools Board of Education; Michigan Supreme Court et. & DOES 1-30

David Schied v. Michigan State Court Administrator; Michigan Department of Civil Rights; Superintendent and Board of Education for the Michigan Department of Education; Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth; Michigan State Administrative Board via the Office of the Michigan Attorney General; DOES 1-20

David Schied v. Ronald Ward, Ken Hamman, Kirk Hobson, Patricia Meyer, Karen Ellsworth, Jessica Murray, Jennifer Bouhana, Patricia Ham, and Joe D. Mosier, both in their individual and official capacities (USDC EDM case No. 09-12374)

David Schied (on behalf of "Student A") v. Scott Snyder, Lynn Mossoian, Kenneth Roth, Richard Fanning, Jr. David Soebbing, Harvalee Saunto, Donna Paruszkiewicz, Mary E. Fayad, Susan Liebetreau, Donald S. Yarab, Catherine D. Anderle, (all in their individual capacities) and Arne Duncan (in his official capacity as USDOE) (USDC EDM case No. 5:09-cv-11307)

MORE PREVIOUSLY CITED AUTHORITIES IN THE CASE RECORD

FEDERAL

Art. I § 8, cl.9 (U.S. Constitution)

Art. III, § 1 (U.S. Constitution)

Art. III, § 3, clause 1 (U.S. Constitution)

Bill of Rights (U.S. Constitution)

Due Process Clause (U.S. Constitution)

Federal Judiciary Act of 1789, ch. 20, 1 Stat. 92

Rules Enabling Act of 1934 (Act of June 19, 1934)

Rules of Decision Act of 1789

Supremacy Clause (U.S. Constitution)

Thirteenth Amendment

Act of June 25, 1948 c. 646, 62 Stat. 991

Title 18 U.S.C. §4

18 U.S.C. §2331

18 U.S.C. § 3771

18 U.S.C. § 1652 (1982)

18 U.S.C. §2071

28 U.S.C. §2072

Title 28 of the United States Code

American Ins. Co. v. Canter, 26 U.S. (1 Pet.) 511 (1828)

Antoine v. Byers & Anderson, Inc., - U.S. -, -, 113 S.Ct. 2167, 2171

L.Ed.2d 391 (1993)

Bi-Metallic Co. v. Colorado, 239 U.S. 441, 36 S. Ct. 141, 60 L. Ed. 372, 1915 U.S.

Burns v. Reed, U.S., 111 S. Ct. 1934, 1946, 114 L. Ed. 2d 547 (1991)

Davidson Bros. Marble Co. v. Gibson, 213 U. S. 10, 213 U. S. 18

Erie Railroad v. Tompkins, 304 U.S. 64 (1938)

Forrester v. White, 484 U.S. 219, 229-30, 108 S. Ct. 538, 545-46, 98 L. Ed. 2d 555 (1988)

Glidden Company v. Zdanok, 370 U.S. 530 (1962)

Hanna v. Plumer, 380 U.S. 460, 471 (1965)

Hudson v. Parker, 156 U. S. 277, 156 U. S. 284

Meek v. Centre County Banking Co., 268 U. S. 426, 268 U. S. 434

Northern Pipeline Co. v. Marathon Pipeline Co., 458 U.S. 50 102 S. Ct. 2858 (1982)
O'Donoghue v. United States. 289 U.S. 516 (1933)
Sibbach v. Wilson, 312 U.S. 1 (1941)
Venner v. Great Northern Ry. Co., 209 U.S. 24, 209 U. S. 35
United States v. Tillamooks, 329 U.S. 40; 341 U.S. 48
United States v. Will, 449 U.S. 200, 217 218 (1980)
Willy v. Coastal Corp. 503 U.S. 131 (1992)
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure
Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 3
Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 4
Local Court Rules for the Eastern District of Michigan
Statutes at Large

MICHIGAN

MCL 18.351
MCL 750.10
MCL 761.1
MCL 764.1(a)
MCL 764.1(b)
MCL 767.3
MCR Rule 6.101

OTHER

Bone, Robert. Mapping the Boundaries of a Dispute: Conceptions of Ideal Lawsuit Structure From the Field Code to the Federal Rules, 89 Colum. L. Rev. 1, 21 n.42 (1989)

Burbank, Stephen. The Rules Enabling Act of 1934. (1982) pp. 1018-1197

Carrington, Paul. Substance and Procedure in the Rules Enabling Act. Duke Law Journal. (Vol. 1989; No. 2; April)

Cook, Walter, “Substance” and “Procedure” in the Conflict of Laws, 42 Yale L.J. 333, 335-336 (1933)

Cordero, Richard. Exposing Judges’ Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Wrongdoing

Fields, Gary, and Emshwiller, John. As Criminal Laws Proliferate, More Are Ensnared (7/23/11) Wall Street Journal

Fletcher, George. Parochial Versus Universal Criminal Law. Journal of International Criminal Justice (Vol. 3) (2005)

Fletcher, George. *Rethinking Criminal Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, reprinted 2000)

Fullerton, Maryellen. *No Light at the End of the Pipeline: Confusion Surrounds Legislative Courts*. 49 Brook L. Rev. (1983)

Main, Thomas. *The Procedural Foundation of Substantive Law*. Washington University Law Review, Vol. 87 (2009)

Martin, Michael. *Inherent Judicial Power: Flexibility Congress Did Not Write Into the Federal Rules of Evidence*. 57 Tex. L. Rev. Vol. 2; pp.167-202. (Jan. 1979)

Mishkin, *Some Further Last Words on Erie-The Thread*, 87 Harv. L. Rev. 1687 (1974)

Risinger, Michael. *“Substance” and “Procedure” Revisited: With Some Afterthoughts on the Constitutional Problems of “Irrebuttable Presumptions,”* 30 UCLA L.Rev. at 190, 201 (1982)

Scott, *Actions at Law in the Federal Courts*, 38 Harv. L. Rev. 1, 3-4 (1924)

Silberman, Linda. *Judicial Adjuncts Revisited: The Proliferation of Ad Hoc Procedure*. 137 Univ. of Penn. L. Rev. (1989) pp. 2131-2178

Weaver, Justice Elizabeth and Schock, David. *Judicial Deceit: Tyranny and Secrecy at the Michigan Supreme Court*

Weinstein, Jack. *After Fifty Years of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: Are the Barriers to Justice Being Raised?* University of Pennsylvania Law Review. Vol. 137

CITATIONS ENTERED INTO THIS CASE BY LAWRENCE PIERSOL'S OWN UNCONSTITUTIONAL “INTERNATIONAL JUDGE'S ASSOCIATION” COURT OPERATING IN THE USDC-SD THROUGH MEMBERSHIP IN THE “FEDERAL JUDGES ASSOCIATION”

Forma Pauperis

28 U.S.C. § 1915

Martin-Trigona v. Stewart, 691 E2d 856, 857 (8th Cir. 1982)

Lee v. McDonald's Corp., 231 F.3d 456,459 (8th Cir. 2000)

Babino v. Janssen & Son, 201iWL 6813137, at *1 (D.S.D. 2017)

Citations of Judicial and Court Obligations

Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94, 127 S.Ct. 2197, 167 L.Ed.2d 1081 (2001) – “the court must liberally construe it and assume as true all facts well pleaded in the complaint.”

Williams v. Willits, 853 F2d 586, 588 (8th Cir. 1988) – “reviewing court has the duty to examine a pro se complaint “to determine if the allegations provide for relief on any possible theory”

DISMISSAL OF CASE AS FRIVOLOUS, FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM, AND IMMUNITY – UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i-ii) and 28 U.S.C. § 191(e)(2)(B)(i-ii)

“Plaintiff does not allege sufficient facts to establish any violation of his human rights, and this claim is dismissed.” 28 U.S.C. § 191(e)(2)(B)(i-ii) – The OMISSION of the “5” (after “191”) by this citation creates an official reference to that which is nonexistent. This may be construed as “*palpable error*”. All other references to citations below go so well beyond palpable error as to provide at least the *appearance* of intentional acts of tort, seditious and treasonous forms of “*judicial misconduct*”, *insurrection*, and “*domestic terrorism*” for reasons of GROSS OMISSIONS explained therein.

NOTE: All of the “COUNTS” alleged were “DISMISSED” summarily against a *forma pauperis* litigant while also dismissing as “*moot*” significant MOTIONS for this ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD to provide BENEFICIARY-RELATOR as “*whistleblower*” and “*Private, Public Proxy*” (acting in a capacity similar to a statutory “*Private Attorney General*”) with “*Service of Process*” of the SUMMONS and COMPLAINT upon the named CO-TRUSTEES referenced by this “*judge*” Lawrence Piersol and his Clerk Matthew Thelen. Such unconstitutional “*DENIAL*” has effectively barred the named “*DEFENDANTS*” (as defined by Piersol and Thelen, not Schied); from receiving such SUMMONS and COMPLAINTS by being personally served by the U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE; and with provision for BENEFICIARY-RELATOR to be provided access to the Court’s “*Electronic [EM/ECF] Filing System*” on equal par with “*attorneys*” of the MONOPOLY that CORPORATE fictional “*BAR*” members otherwise have on the Court’s electronic system that effectively exclude access by private, sovereign, American men and women.

The listing of all these COUNTS are shown below by graphic reference to BENEFICIARY-RELATOR’s “TABLE OF CONTENTS” in his DISTRICT COURT “COMPLAINT”, which were all *seditiously “dismissed” fraudulently and treasonously* by reference to the citation of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i-ii).

COUNTS AND ARGUMENTS SUPPORTING THE BASIS OF THIS "ORIGINAL COMPLAINT".....	164
COUNT ONE - COMMON LAW and HUMAN RIGHTS TORTS (Alleged Against All Named TRUSTEES).....	164
COUNT TWO - VIOLATION OF THE FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT (FTCA) and the JUDICIAL CONDUCT DISABILITY ACT (JCDA)	169
COUNT THREE - CONSTITUTIONAL TORTS (Alleged Against All Named TRUSTEES).....	171
COUNT FOUR - FIRST AMENDMENT VIOLATIONS (Alleged Against All Named TRUSTEES).....	178
COUNT FIVE - FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT and AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT VIOLATIONS (Alleged Against All Named TRUSTEES).....	179
COUNT SIX - (CONSPIRACY TO) DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW 18 USC §§ 241-242 and 42 USC § 1983 (Alleged Against All Named TRUSTEES).....	180
COUNT SEVEN - RACKETEERING AND CORRUPTION ("RICO" VIOLATIONS) (Alleged Against All Named TRUSTEES).....	181
BENEFICIARY David Schied has levied herein a case chock full of ALLEGATIONS and EVIDENCE of a "Pattern and Practice" of unconstitutional DISCRIMINATION and RETALIATION against sovereign American People, of which BENEFICIARY Schied is herein acting on the behalf of himself (and others similarly situated), with CLAIMS IN COMMERCE against the SURETIES of all TRUSTEES, by way of the PUBLIC TRUST(s) guarantees of TRUSTEES' "Oaths of Offices" as fiduciary Public "Officials", "Agents", and "Functionaries".....	194
COUNT EIGHT - CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS / CDC ORDER ON EVICTION MORATORIUMS (Alleged Against All Named TRUSTEES).....	200
COUNT NINE - "FORCED SERVITUDE" - VIOLATION OF THE THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT (Alleged Against All Named TRUSTEES).....	204
COUNT TEN - VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT (Alleged Against All Named TRUSTEES).....	208
COUNT ELEVEN - MALICIOUS PROSECUTION AND ABUSE OF PROCESS (Alleged Against All Named TRUSTEES).....	209
COUNT TWELVE - SEDITION, TREASON, INSURRECTION, and DOMESTIC TERRORISM (Alleged Against All Named TRUSTEES).....	216
COUNT THIRTEEN - FEDERAL WHISTLEBLOWER ("QUI TAM") ACTIONS UNDER THE FALSE CLAIMS ACT and the PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL DOCTRINE (Alleged Against All Named TRUSTEES).....	224

Lawrence Piersol's Fraudulent Citations by FALSE STATEMENTS and/or
GROSS OMISSIONS of FACTS and/or CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS –

NOTE: These "Threadbare" and Unsupported "Conclusory" Falsities (Written Below
in Paragraphed *Italics*) Can No Longer Stand Alone Without Obfuscating the Actual
TRUTHS Behind These Citations; Therefore, Each Citation is Presented Herein With
an Appropriately Concise Narrative (in Same Paragraph Underlined) of the Missing
Context and Nature of the GROSS OMISSIONS by *Foreign Agent* (i.e., of the
FEDERAL JUDGES ASSOCIATION and Its Governance by the UNITED NATIONS'

Through Extensive Membership in the INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF JUDGES and FJA/IAJ "Member Judges" Victoria Roberts (USDC-EDM) and Lawrence Piersol (USDC-SDWD) as follows:

"Mr. Schied contracted sepsis in 2018 and as a result, both of his legs have been amputated below the knees. He has lost several fingers to amputation as well. Plaintiff is disabled, and states in his filings that he is a recipient of Social Security and Medicare benefits." – GROSSLY OMITTING that "Sui Juris Schied" and/or "BENEFICIARY-RELATOR Schied" and/or "Private, Public Proxy Schied" had also "stated" that the named CO-TRUSTEES (FBI) were instrumental in the *factual circumstances* leading to the "contracted sepsis" and therefore "Legal Discovery" was needed into the "Coverup" of these Circumstances by Higher "RICO" Levels of Other named CO-TRUSTEES (USDOJ).

"[Sui Juris Schied] has set forth a frivolous and malicious conspiracy theory that judges in the Eastern District of Michigan have engaged in judicial misconduct about which he has complained numerous times, and about which he has '70 boxes of information. ... He accuses those judges of operating a 'protectionist racket of insurrectionism and domestic terrorism'" – Not only GROSSLY OMITTING the proper context by exclusion of other relevant FACT and EVIDENCE, but by also substituting the word "information" for the proper word "EVIDENCE" that was otherwise actually used by BENEFICIARY-RELATOR David Schied; and not as misleadingly cited by FJA/IAJ "Foreign Agent" Lawrence Piersol as a matter of this instant "ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD".

"Plaintiff alleges he has established 108 constitutional torts and issued citations to various government officials over the years, based on his perception of constitutional violations. This has factored into his demand for damages in the amount of total of \$1,053,560,000.00" – Not only misstating the exact amount being CLAIMED by the Lower ARTICLE III Court case filing; but also GROSSLY OMITTING proper references to the FACTS and EVIDENCE showing that all CO-TRUSTEES had been repeatedly "served" these "Constitutional Citations" with CLAIMS IN COMMERCE by way of 3rd party "Notary Presentment" and all acquiesced to these CLAIMS by their own "tacit agreements".

"It is clear [Sui Juris Schied] has had access to the courts in Michigan, and now in South Dakota. His disagreement with the outcome does not mean he was denied access to the Courts." – GROSSLY OMITTING the FACTS and EVIDENCE presented in the Record showing "Sui Juris Schied's" former association with MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT "chief justice" Elizabeth Weaver, who had BENEFICIARY-RELATOR Schied at her home, cooked him lunch, and autographed her book, "JUDICIAL DECEIT: Tyranny & Secrecy at the Michigan Supreme Court", both concurring with and substantiating "Private, Public Proxy Schied's" allegations about the unconstitutional, seditious, and treasonous actions of these and many other

STATE BAR OF MICHIGAN members as “*officers of the [Michigan] Courts*” privately and politically serving themselves and not otherwise serving the sovereign People of Michigan and America with their activities “*on and off the bench*”. This citation also GROSSLY OMITS proper consideration for the “*Backward-Looking Access-To-Courts*” legal doctrine holding firmly to the premise that such Michigan court “*access*” must be “*meaningful access*” and not merely the granting of “*forma pauperis*” status and a name on case docket sheets.

“*Statements of Facts*: ... It is noteworthy that [Sui Juris Schied] has alleged all Counts against all Defendants, who are not similarly situated ... [Sui Juris Schied] has styled his action as a ‘*Whistleblower*’... but that designation is not accurate.” – GROSSLY OMITTING the individual set of circumstances serving as the proper CONTEXTS for each of the stated CLAIMS that FJA and IJA “*Foreign Agent*” Piersol instead bunched together as if these claims had no other pertinent contexts; and thus, GROSSLY MISCHARACTERIZED the nature of these allegations by his own stand-alone statements of outright FRAUD. What Piersol also GROSSLY OMITS is the persisting COVER PAGE reminder that “*Whistleblower*” Schied, having filed this case in the COMMON LAW as a *Private, Public Proxy*, while “*blowing the whistle*” in his role as an “*advocate for the government* ... of, by, and for the People”; and as “One of the Sovereign People” acting in his role – in the responsible “*Office of the Citizen*” and reporting publicly the wrongful acts of his own “*government servants*” and their “*licensees*” who are perpetually engaged in an “*employment*” relationship with the Sovereign People, and in “*constant vigilance*” in overseeing and auditing these indentured “*employees*” (indentured through OATHS and DUTIES that all government “*servants*” have under the U.S. CONSTITUTION) as “*Fiduciaries*” acting in gross violations of their OATHS and DUTIES OF OFFICE under the PUBLIC TRUST contracted with the People (including David Schied) by the U.S. CONSTITUTION.

“[Sui Juris Schied] alleges that an ADA claim arises from the eviction action instituted by his landlords in Michigan who are private parties. The claim is dismissed against them. The landlords’ asking plaintiff to sign a new lease is not retaliation. and involved a private party, so the claim is dismissed.” – GROSSLY OMITTING that one of the “*landlords*” Eva Ortner – was and remains a formally sworn “*officer of the court*” as one of the listed CO-TRUSTEES with membership to the STATE BAR OF MICHIGAN, who orchestrated the “*Illegal Eviction*” through her fellow RICO Crime Syndicate and Domestic Terrorist Network members operating courts corruptly as “*Continuing Financial Crimes Enterprises*”.

“[Sui Juris Schied] alleges that FBI agents violated the ADA when they went to his hospital room, He does not allege sufficient facts in support of his claim and it is dismissed. Plaintiff alleges that Capital One and its President, Richard Fairburn, violated the ADA but offers insufficient facts in support of his claim, which is dismissed.” – GROSSLY OMITTING a plethora of both FACTS and EVIDENCE

placed supportingly into the instant ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD and backed additionally by a sworn AFFIDAVIT OF TRUTH.

*[Sui Juris Schied] alleges' both fraud and false statements resulting from the denial of certain benefits. The Court dismisses these claims to the extent they are based upon alleged fraud or false statements, as there is insufficient evidence to support the allegations. The Court also finds no evidence to support Plaintiff's claim that he was discriminated against because of his disability, and dismisses the claim as it purports to state a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act." – GROSSLY OMITTING both FACTS and EVIDENCE placed supportingly into the instant ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD by Private, Public Proxy Schied; and gives an even further "appearance" of prejudicial bias and "obstruction of justice" against BENEFICIARY-RELATOR by constructing a "Catch 22' COERCIVE circumstance between the "FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE/LOCAL COURT RULES" restricting *Sui Juris* Schied to "short and concise" factual allegations, and the plethora of SWORN STATEMENTS, FACTS, and EVIDENCE actually provided as a matter of RECORD in *Sui Juris* Schied's *good faith* compliance with these Rules, but without full disclosure by FJA and IAJ member "judge" Lawrence Piersol that literally no amount of facts and evidence will "suffice" to allow government "whistleblower" and "Private, Public Proxy" Schied "meaningful access" to the UNITED STATES courts. Additionally, such "Fraud Upon the Court" is an "Obstruction of Justice" by barring both procedural "Discovery" and "Jury Trial" as both procedurally required by the Rules and demanded at the onset of BENEFICIARY-RELATOR's initial filings in this case.*

"Count VI - Conspiracy to Deprive [Sui Juris Schied] of Rights: [Sui Juris Schied] cites 18 U.S.C. §§ 241-242 as the basis for this claim" – GROSSLY OMITTING the original citation by Private Public Proxy Schied of including "deprivation of rights under color of law" under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 as clearly shown below, excerpted from the TABLE OF CONTENTS of BENEFICIARY-RELATOR's original "COMPLAINT" filing in the lower USDC-SDWD over which FJA and IAJ member "judges" Roberto Lange and Lawrence Piersol administratively pretended to "judicially" preside.

**COUNT SIX - (CONSPIRACY TO) DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER
COLOR OF LAW 18 USC §§ 241-242 and 42 USC § 1983
(Alleged Against All Named TRUSTEES).....180**

"Courts repeatedly have held that there is no private right of action under 18 U.S.C. § 241. Federal authorities have the task of determining whether to pursue criminal charges. ... Because there is no private right of action under these provisions, this claim is dismissed' – GROSSLY OMITTING recognition of the significant FACT that the NINTH and TENTH AMENDMENTS make clear the guarantee that the sovereign People "RETAIN ALL RIGHTS" – including the Rights cited by the

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE to “*Alter or Abolish*” any “*Form of Government*” that is destructive of the “*ends*” of “*Safety and Happiness*” to the Sovereign American People.

“*[Sui Juris Schied]’s Complaint indicates his eviction was commenced in 2017. He alleges that the local city government engaged in fraud in connection with obtaining land for development in an area which encompasses “[Sui Juris Schied]’s rental unit, and supplies aerial photos of the scene. He also supplies information about heated arguments with his landlord and asserts his rent was current. His allegations of current rent, all allegedly fraudulent land transaction, and arguments with his landlord make it clear that that the eviction which commenced 2017 does not fall within the parameters of the CDC Order.*” – Lawrence Piersol FRAUDULENTLY substituted (again) the word “*information*” for the EVIDENCE presented into the official ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD by way of *Private Public Proxy Schied* having submitted bona fide “*AUDIO RECORDING TRANSCRIPTS*” – submitted by AFFIDAVIT OF TRUTH to the transcripts authenticity; and while FJA and IAJ “*Foreign Agent*” member Lawrence Piersol also GROSSLY OMITTED the many FACTS and EVIDENCE presented as a matter of official RECORD to show that there were multiple incidents of “*attempted eviction*”, with the previous one having been executed in 2017 leading up to the attempted murder, and the second “*commencement of eviction*” being committed as a “*new incident or occurrence*” in 2020; thus, otherwise falling within the “*parameters of the CDC Order*”.

“*Although it is unclear, [Sui Juris Schied] seems to allege two issues with debt. One is a possible student loan debt of \$85,000, which he thinks should be resolved in his favor by educational loan institutions. [Sui Juris Schied] has not alleged sufficient facts to establish any of the circumstances surrounding this debt or its possible collection, and his claim is dismissed.*” – GROSSLY OMITTING a plethora of SWORN STATEMENTS of “*FACTS well pleaded*” and “*with demanded remedy*” by “*access*” to a GRAND JURY and PETIT JURY of other sovereign American People; as these facts were submitted under the plausible theory that the numerous specified CO-TRUSTEES of the UNITED STATES “*principals*” and “*agents*” had conspired not only to dishonor the terms of student loan PROMISSORY NOTE(s) for “*discharging*” loans upon Debtor death or being rendered “*totally and permanently disabled*”, but also that the same had conspired with the THREE CREDIT BUREAUS to make FALSE CLAIMS of debts that were otherwise owed to be discharged, and thus, causing tortuous harm to BENEFICIARY-RELATOR’s credit and obstructing him from acting practically to find new housing in the face of the CO-TRUSTEES “*targeting*” him for EVICTION and homelessness.

“*[Sui Juris Schied] also has filed a claim against Capital One Financial Corporation and Richard Fairburn, its President, which appears to center on a tire repair, payment by a credit card, and a misunderstanding with the tire shop. [Sui Juris Schied] has failed to state sufficient facts in support of his claim, and it is dismissed.*” – GROSSLY OMITTING a plethora of SWORN STATEMENTS of “*FACTS well*

pledged' and "with demanded remedy" by "access" to a GRAND JURY and PETIT JURY as these facts were submitted under the plausible theory that – besides establishing a fraudulent CLAIM OF DEBT that, in fact, did not exist, the named CO-TRUSTEES committed extreme acts of discrimination against a disabled person by a RECORDED "policy and practice" of CO-TRUSTEES recording ALL incoming phone calls from the public while upholding a CORPORATE refusal to provide an "equal" and "reasonable" accommodation to disabled people who also wished to record phone calls with CAPITAL ONE "principals" and "agents"; and the UNITED STATES as the "banking regulator" having tortuously refused – as with all other CLAIMS of DISCRIMINATION, RACKETEERING and CORRUPTION – its DUTIES and OBLIGATIONS to address these matters other than through Sedition, Treason, RICO coverups, and Insurrection, as was demonstrated by this FJA and IAJ member "judge" Lawrence Piersol and his "Clerk of the Court" accomplice (i.e., the *prima facie* example of this "judge's" FRAUD UPON THE COURT is found in the reasonable fact that, if the "misunderstanding [was] with the tire shop", the tire shop would have been named in a separate lawsuit as was the U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL case now "inextricably intertwined" with this instant one case due to similar forms of FRAUD by Lawrence Piersol and his "Clerk" Matthew Thelen).

"The basis for [Sui Juris Schied]'s Count XI is difficult to discern. There is no evidence that he has been prosecuted for anything since 2012. In that year, a state court judge in Michigan held him in contempt and ordered him to jail for 30 days. The District Court in the Eastern District of Michigan dismissed his subsequent federal filing about the case, and enjoined future filings without leave of court. Schied v. Khalil, 2016 WL 4727477 (E.D.N.Y. 2016). [Sui Juris Schied] had sued for money damages, claiming officials had 'kidnapped' him to take him to jail. Schied v. Khalil, 2016 WL 11472341 (E.D. N.Y. 2016)(R&R)" – GROSSLY OMITTING the FACTS that this was but one of many examples of the "years of targeting" which occurred because of BENEFICIARY-RELATOR's many years of "whistleblowing" with and on behalf of quiet "court-watchers" and presenting clearly marked references in this instant case to numerous sworn AFFIDAVITS in support of the CLAIMS that this was an unprovoked (except by "STATE judge" Karen Khalil and her criminal cohorts) "terrorist event" and "kidnapping" witnessed by many others with sworn written testimonies, who were all terrorized as they sat quietly watching and taking notes in the public "gallery" where this "judicial usurper" Karen Khalil otherwise had no jurisdiction whatsoever.

"Count XI – Malicious Prosecution and Abuse of Process Claim – Absent a prosecution, [Sui Juris Schied]'s claim fails legally and factually to fulfill the elements of the tort of malicious prosecution" – GROSSLY OMITTING both SWORN STATEMENTS by AFFIDAVITS and clear references to EVIDENCE proving beyond any reasonable doubt that the 2012 "Backward-Looking Access-To-Court" case referenced fraudulently by Lawrence Piersol was the very one in which the "malicious prosecution" CLAIM was being made because, in that case, Karen Khalil had fraudulently constructed a "Judgment Order" falsely claiming a "case number" and a

“case captioning” and a “plea of guilty” and a “Defendant denial to the judge’s offer of a court appointed attorney” whereas the FACTS and EVIDENCE of sworn “Witness Affidavits” proved that no such actions ever took place and that there was no “prosecution” because there was no “case”, no “prosecutor”, no “arraignment”, no “indictment”, no “due process”, or anything except the blatant summary “kidnapping and false incarceration” of BENEFICIARY-RELATOR as he had been otherwise sitting remarkably quietly in the “public gallery” taking notes and “auditing” the constitutionality of what were docketed as “informal hearings” and other court proceedings, at which BENEFICIARY-RELATOR was objectively sitting along with several other “court watchers” as “witnesses” to these tortuous “terrorism” events, being WELL-OUTSIDE THE JURISDICTION of all cases otherwise being transacted through similar forms of RACKETEERING and INSURRECTION.

“[Sui Juris Schied] has alleged abuse of process by one of the Defendants in connection with a notice to him to quit the premises, a filing of an eviction action in Michigan state court, [BENEFICIARY-RELATOR] subsequent removal of the action to federal court, and the federal court’s remand of the action to state court. [Sui Juris Schied] has alleged insufficient facts to support this claim and it is dismissed.” – GROSSLY OMITTING the NAMES of STATE BAR member attorneys as otherwise clearly named by BENEFICIARY-RELATOR as CO-TRUSTEES with clear, accurate, and “concisely written” allegations about the FACTS, the LAWS violated, and providing reference to the EVIDENCE and WITNESSES – to go along with acknowledged “aerial photographs” – and the practical “Remedy” in this ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD via DEMANDED JURY TRIAL and GRAND JURY proceedings. This FJA and IAJ member “judge” went to obvious great lengths to keep the identity of these STATE BAR member attorneys under “sealed” nondisclosure.

“Count XII-Sedition, Treason, Insurrection, Domestic Terrorism Claim … It is unlikely that conduct involving sedition, treason, insurrection, or domestic terrorism would or should be the subject of a civil lawsuit for damages by a private plaintiff. In the United States, we rely on our public officials who have been entrusted with the responsibility to investigate such claims and to prosecute where appropriate. … Whether as a criminal or civil claim, [Sui Juris Schied]’s claim is dismissed” – GROSSLY OMITTING the FACTS, as presented in UNREBUTTED Sworn Statements supported by overwhelming amounts of EVIDENCE to show that BENEFICIARY-RELATOR and the “Public at Large” have all “relied on public officials” entrusted by “Oath and Duties of Office” who have acted – in a tracked repeated “pattern and practice” – egregiously in violation of their FIDUCIARY Oaths and Duties, and have instead acted in such way as to provide “secondary” levels of “safe harbor and comfort” to multi-tiered levels of “predicate” criminal Racketeering and Corruption.

“Count XIII – Whistleblower, False Claims Act, Private Attorney General Claim – [Sui Juris Schied]’s claim does not fit the definitions applicable to those terms. [Sui Juris Schied] phrases his claim as one in which he acts as Qui Tam whistleblower.

*and debt collector for the sovereign people as 'Taxpayers' under the False Claims Act. ... [Sui Juris Schied] fashions a list of duties for federal and state employees and alleges they have breached them; accuses them of human rights atrocities; accuses them of sedition and treason; and repeats the sedition and treason claims while lodging many other accusations of criminal and immoral behavior. His allegation of 'false claims' is in connection with a letter concerning Medicare, which he says is a 'false claim.' He alleges that when Medicare states it does 'not discriminate, on certain bases, that is a 'false claim.' The Medicare notice may or may not be accurate, but is not a false claim within the purview of the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729-33. Plaintiff has failed to allege sufficient facts in support of his claim and it is dismissed. [Sui Juris Schied] alleges Capital One and its President, Richard Fairburn, have made false claims but has not supported his claim with sufficient evidence, and it is dismissed." – GROSSLY OMITTING the individual set of circumstances serving as the proper CONTEXTS for each of the stated CLAIMS that FJA and IJA "Foreign Agent" Piersol instead bunched together as if these claims had no other contexts; and thus, GROSSLY MISCHARACTERIZED the nature of these allegations by his own stand-alone statements of outright FRAUD (by such significant omissions and by reference to a "list of duties" when reference by *Private, Public Proxy* Schied was always instead referring to the OATHS and DUTIES that all government "servants" have under the U.S. CONSTITUTION). In effect, while introducing these FALSE statements as falling under the category of statutory claims, Piersol also GROSSLY OMITS the significant FACT that BENEFICIARY-RELATOR has filed this case "Sui Juris" and "Ex Rel" on behalf of the American People as a "Private, Public Proxy" acting in the COMMON LAW and bringing in his OWN "ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD", and not as an "employee" of any entity (unless the "government" wishes to construe BENEFICIARY-RELATOR as being assigned a SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER and a "Taxpayer ID" as unsupported and far-reaching theoretical EVIDENCE that BENEFICIARY-RELATOR has all along been working "for" the government and not having any Sovereign rights whatsoever as a One of the Sovereign People "in the private" sector, in which case this was done "without informed consent"). Instead, *Private Public Proxy* Schied is "blowing the whistle" – as "government of, by, and for the People" and as "One of the Sovereign People" – against his own "government servants" and their "licensees" who are engaged in an "employment" relationship with the Sovereign People as "Fiduciaries" acting in gross violations of their OATHS and DUTIES OF OFFICE under the PUBLIC TRUST contracted with the People (including David Schied) by the U.S. CONSTITUTION.*

"A Plaintiff can satisfy the requirements of Rule 9(b) by pleading such facts as the time, place, and content of the defendant's false representations, as well as the details of the defendant's fraudulent acts. United States ex rel. Joshi v. St. Luke's Hosp., Inc., 441 F.3d 552,556 (8th Cir. 2006). In this case, Plaintiff does not identify any specific instance of fraud but alleges Defendants have committed 'affirmative acts of discrimination, retaliation, RICO crimes, sedition, treason, insurrection, and domestic terrorism.'" – GROSSLY OMITTING (again) the CONTEXT by which the categorized allegations are supported by overwhelming numbers of Sworn

AFFIDAVITS and EVIDENCE pertaining to the referenced “Backward-Looking Access-To-Court Cases” wherein all of those “legal details” are referenced and included in the ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD but not always provided within the “exclusive” context of the FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE requiring – according to RULES 8(a)(1) and 8(d)(1) – only “short, plain, statement[s] of the claim[s] showing that the pleader is entitled to relief” via “simple, concise, and direct” allegations.

“[Sui Juris Schied] does not identify any specific instance of fraud but alleges Defendants have committed ‘affirmative acts of discrimination, retaliation, RICO crimes, sedition, treason, insurrection; and domestic terrorism.’” – This citation goes so far beyond mere GROSSLY OMITTING as to be “PRIMA FACIE FRAUD” warranting JUDICIAL IMPEACHMENT and ARREST/IMPRISONMENT by a COMMON LAW CONSTABLE; since this ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD is chock full of SWORN AFFIDAVITS and items of EVIDENCE proving the specific elements of each of the allegations of Fraud by the CO-TRUSTEES. This form and frequency of such FRAUD is as blatant as this FJA and IAJ “Foreign Agent” Piersol continually disregarding the COVER PAGE information for this case – as also arguably objected to the Clerk’s intentional “error” on the DOCKET SHEET – that this case was initially filed and being continuously pursued CONSTITUTIONALLY as a COMMON LAW case in an “ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD”, as a case between “BENEFICIARY-RELATOR and CO-TRUSTEES” and not between STATUTORY “Plaintiff and Defendants”, and with a DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL solidly intact throughout to the present.

“[Sui Juris Schied] may not maintain an FCA claim *pro se*. *United States v. Onan*, 190 F.2d!, 6 (8th Cir. 1951). See also *Zerbst*, 2020 WL 114185.” – In the same fashion as depicted above as blatant “impeachable offenses” through these many FRAUDS BY GROSS OMISSIONS, this FJA and IAJ “Foreign Agent” Piersol continually uses “word substitutions” of his own to CRIMINALLY and OPENLY “deprive of rights under color of law” and to mischaracterize the nature of this case, the nature of the Sovereign Status and Active Position of BENEFICIARY-RELATOR as “*Sui Juris*” and “*Private, Public Proxy*” on the Sovereign People’s behalf (“*Ex Rel*”), and “blowing the whistle” on his own “government servants” and their “licensees” engaged in an “employment” relationship with the Sovereign People as “*Fiduciaries*” acting in gross violations of their OATHS and DUTIES OF OFFICE under the PUBLIC TRUST contracted by the U.S. CONSTITUTION.

“Judicial Immunity – [Sui Juris Schied’s] suit against federal and state judges for damages raises the question of the applicability and extent of judicial immunity. In numerous cases, the courts have expressed the rule set forth in *Mireles v Waco*, 502 U.S. 9,112 S.Ct. 286, 287,116 LEd.2d 9 (1991) (cleaned up) that ‘generally, a judge is immune from a suit for money damages.’… The court cited the ‘broad protections’ for judges, and noted that ‘allegations of malice or corruption do not defeat judicial immunity. *Id.* (quoting *Stump v. Sparkman*, 435 U.S. 349, 355-56, 98 S.Ct. 1099, 5.5

L.Ed.2d 331 (1978). A claim for 'alleged deprivation of civil rights' is not an exception to the general rule, as the court made clear in Justice Network, Inc. v. Craighead County, 931 F.3d 753, 760 (8th Cir. 2019)." – GROSSLY OMITTING that the allegations are accompanied by SWORN STATEMENTS, signed, sworn AFFIDAVITS of various "Witnesses", and references to such Witnesses and Evidence that will be uncovered by "due process of DISCOVERY" and determined "on the merits" by a JURY and GRAND JURY of the Sovereign People, and not on the summary LIES of this "foreign Agent" of the FJA and its membership in the IJA of the UNITED NATIONS following a completely different "CONSTITUTION" than that governing this instant ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD in accordance with the "Supreme Law of the Land" as established and ordained by the People and "free Persons" of America themselves, and not foreign NATIONS, or foreign CORPORATIONS, or foreign GOVERNMENTS as this instant case herein proves Victoria Roberts, Roberto Lange, and Lawrence Piersol – as well as the "Tribunal" of _____, _____, and _____ are all treasonously carrying out, as compounded FJA and IJA "members", OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THEIR OATHS AND DUTIES, which are otherwise to be owed exclusively to the American People.

“[Sui Juris] Schied has sued numerous federal and state judges in this lawsuit. His many prior cases have been heard by numerous judges, and he has been unsuccessful in his prior lawsuits. In this case, despite there being a lack of evidence to support his Claims, he has alleged corruption, various conspiracies, treason, sedition, domestic terrorism, and insurrection against several judges.” – GROSSLY OMITTING the FACTS and EVIDENCE, as has been the “*pattern and practice*” of “numerous judges” that are acting in Seditious and Treasonous fashion as Insurrectionists and Domestic Terrorists, and as “*foreign Agents*” of the FJA and the IAJ under a very different CONSTITUTION of the UNITED NATIONS ... does not necessarily mean that BENEFICIARY-RELATOR David Schied “*has been unsuccessful in his prior lawsuits*” and having “*a lack of evidence to support his claims*”. Instead, the “*lemons*” dished out by these crooked BAR members and “*judicial usurpers*” of the Sovereign People’s Power has been used to further the EVIDENCE OF TREASON through the instant “*Backward-Looking Access-To-Court*” CLAIMS as the resulting “*lemonade*”.

“Based on longstanding precedent, all of the judges [Sui Juris Schied as Private, Public Proxy and BENEFICIARY-RELATOR] has named as Defendants in this case are absolutely immune and are dismissed with prejudice from this lawsuit.” – GROSSLY OMITTING the FACT that the “basis” for the “justice” system is ARTICLE III of the U.S. CONSTITUTION created and ordained by the Sovereign People, and not “longstanding precedence” of “all the judges” ... who have committed proven “secondary” acts of Treason to award one another “immunity” for “predicate” acts of the RICO crimes and insurrection, in sponsorship of a two-tiered “Just-Us” elitists system of foreign and “domestic terrorists” enterprises ... as is being alleged in this instant case. Such is the “lemonade” comprised with the EVIDENCE of the “lemons” delivered by this very unjust system playing out herein at this very moment in

American History by “coercion” of both the “governments” and the “populations” through a “silent coup” of these very “judges” referenced by Lawrence Piersol, as his is also simply one of them. Lawrence Piersol’s citation also GROSSLY OMITS the FACT that the only “absolute” is GOD above and not the “immunity” being otherwise held in the Highest esteem by these “Foreign Agents” as BAR members and these FJA/IAJ members who treat themselves and one another as “exceptional” instead of the illegitimate, self-serving Aristocracy that they otherwise are untitled to be under the U.S. CONSTITUTION.

“Prosecutorial Immunity . [Sui Juris Schied] has sued the current and former Attorneys General of the United States, several current and former United States Attorneys and Assistant US Attorneys in Michigan, and current and former members of the office of the Attorney General of Michigan ... As is the case with judicial immunity, absolute immunity for prosecutors has. been recognized for many years ... the accurate determination of guilt or innocence · requires the exercise of judgment by a prosecutor ... absolute immunity will not be defeated by allegations of improper motive in the performance of prosecutorial functions ... when a prosecutor is serving in the role of ‘advocate’ for the government.” – GROSSLY OMITS recognition of the FACT that “government” under the U.S. CONSTITUTION is “*of, by, and for the People*” as the “*sovereigns*” and not the “*judges*” and/or “*prosecutors*” as proclaimed by this “*Foreign Agent*” of the FJA and IAJ *coercively* operating on behalf of the UNITED NATIONS and by Insurrection and Treason against the *government* of the UNITED STATES and the *populations* of American People. Piersol’s citation also GROSSLY OMITS proper recognition that the Sovereign People have the “*final say*” – whether collectively on a JURY, or under the FIRST AMENDMENT guarantee of the “*Right to Petition for Redress*”. Moreover, it additionally GROSSLY OMITS the fact that, as “*Private, Public Proxy*”, BENEFICIARY-RELATOR has been and continues to be acting in the COMMON LAW capacity of a statutory “*Private Attorney General*” and “*One of the Sovereign People*” as “*Whistleblower*” with a private “*interest*” in the matters of Sedition and Treason by named “*judicial usurpers*”, *Insurrectionists*, and *Domestic Terrorists*, BENEFICIARY-RELATOR, therefore, carries with him his own Sovereign “*Prosecutorial*” Rights in his “*role as advocate for the Government ... of, by, and for the Sovereign American People*” as he too performs his TENTH AMENDMENT guaranteed rights to “*prosecutorial functions*” (since the “*enunciation*” of “*rights*” to judges and prosecutors did not authorize even the “*appearance*” of prosecutorial or judicial *misconduct*, or CRIMES as alleged in this case and in previous “*Backward-Looking Access-To-Court*” cases.

“ [I]f there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought ... [venue is proper in] any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court’s personal jurisdiction with respect to such action. ... if it be in the interest of justice... transfer the case to the ... district in which it could have been brought. See *Costlow v. Weeks*, 790 F.2q 1486, 1488 (9th Cir. '1986); *Huot*, 2016 WL 4770040.” – GROSSLY OMITTING the conditions presented to this ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD detailing that this case had been brought forth just three months earlier in the

DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN with an “*EMERGENCY MOTION* upon which “*judicial usurper*” Victoria Roberts simply “*sat*” for four weeks until an illegal EVICTION was carried out in violation of a “*federal*” EVICTION MORATORIUM and while she preoccupied herself in malfeasance by elevating herself to the status of “*senior judge*” for personal profit and prestige; before then dumping the case back to the STATE at the last hour for carrying out the unlawful eviction without any form of due process taking place and leaving BENEFICIARY-RELATOR, as a “*totally and permanently disabled quad-amputee*” completely homeless in the middle of a wintery snow.

“Absolute immunity covers ... [conduct] ... that is intimately associated with the judicial process.” – GROSSLY OMITTING the FACT that all of the conduct alleged as “*criminally*” gross negligent and malfeasant is not in any way “*judicial*” but instead “*administrative*”; being outside the Oaths to “*faithful performance*” of the Duties of Office and necessitating “*affirmative defenses*” provided by “*the Accused*” (CO-TRUSTEES) and not some other government “*official*” (such as Clerk Matthew Thelen or Judge Lawrence Piersol) providing “*prosecutorial abuse*” or “*judicial misconduct*” as if “*two ‘wrongs’ make a ‘right’*”, and giving the *prima facie appearance* of a blatant and intentional “*obstruction of justice*”.

CITATIONS ENTERED INTO THIS CASE BY Jane Kelly, David Stras, and Jonathan Kobes of the COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

“The judgment of the district court dismissing the action is summarily affirmed. See Eighth Circuit Rule 47A(a). The case is remanded to the district court with instructions to unseal the records in this case to the extent feasible.”

This “*Judgment*” egregiously “*affirmed*” a *prima facie fraudulent* judgment in favor or a “*Defendant*” – captioned as “DEPOSITORS INSURANCE COMPANY” – that was never named by BENEFICIARY-RELATOR in the first place; while GROSSLY OMITTING the real “*principal*” of this case, being the “*UNITED STATES*”. This fraudulent “*Judgment*” of the EIGHTH CIRCUIT also GROSSLY OMITTING the factual content of many scores of sworn AFFIDAVITS OF FACTS submitted in this case, as well as the following OTHER KEY DOCUMENTS:

- 1) PRIVATE, PUBLIC PROXY David Schied’s 19-page “COMMON LAW WRIT OF CORAM NOBIS”, [*and*] DEFAULT JUDGMENT received by the Lower Court as a proper filing in this ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD as located at:
http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/080621_CORBUMNOBISDefaultNoticeofAppeal-2.pdf

**DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA, WESTERN DIVISION**

**David Schied, one of the *Sovereign People*;
Recognized by the U.S. CONSTITUTION
"BENEFICIARY" / RELATOR**

v.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al
"CO-TRUSTEES"**

Civ. No. 21-5030

JUDGE Lawrence Piersol

- 1) **"COMMON LAW 'WRIT OF ERROR CORAM NOBIS' IN OPPOSITION TO PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE OF 'CRIMINAL FRAUD AND CONSPIRACY TO DEPRIVE OF RIGHTS' INVOLVING 'JUDICIAL USURPERS' AND 'CLERKS OF THE COURTS' AS 'AGENTS' OF THE NAMED 'CO-TRUSTEES' OF THE CASE CAPTIONED ABOVE".**
- 2) **"FINDING OF CONTEMPT" AND "CERTIFICATION OF FAULT/DEFAULT WITH 'DEFAULT JUDGMENT' AND COMMON LAW 'LEDGER OF [TREBLE] DAMAGES";**
- 3) **"NOTICE OF 'CLAIM OF APPEAL' FOR THE REASONS CITED ABOVE AND BASED UPON 'OVERRIDING AND PALPABLE ERRORS' AND GROSS OMISSIONS OF FACTS; AND INTENTIONAL [TORTUOUS] VIOLATIONS OF THE 'RULES ENABLING ACT'"**

Sent via "Certified" Mail - 7018 1130 0000 3058 7590 on 8/6/21

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
WESTERN DIVISION

David Schied, one of the *Sovereign People*;
Recognized by the U.S. CONSTITUTION
"BENEFICIARY" / RELATOR

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al
"CO-TRUSTEES"

Civ. No. 21-5030

JUDGE Lawrence Piersol

PROOF OF SERVICE

This is to certify that today, 8/6/21, BENEFICIARY/RELATOR David Schied, having established his ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD by serving the DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA - placed into the U.S. ("Priority") MAIL - the signed "ORIGINALS" of the following documents for purposes of receiving time/date stamped copies back from the Court as assured would occur by the Clerk of the Court during a phone conversation dated Monday, 4/19/21:

- 1) BENEFICIARY's/RELATOR's **"COMMON LAW 'WRIT OF ERROR CORAM NOBIS' IN OPPOSITION TO PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE OF 'CRIMINAL FRAUD AND CONSPIRACY TO DEPRIVE OF RIGHTS' INVOLVING 'JUDICIAL USURPERS' AND 'CLERKS OF THE COURTS' AS 'AGENTS' OF THE NAMED 'CO-TRUSTEES' OF THE CASE CAPTIONED ABOVE".** (19 pages) and
- 2) **"FINDING OF CONTEMPT" AND "CERTIFICATION OF FAULT/DEFAULT WITH 'DEFAULT JUDGMENT' AND COMMON LAW 'LEDGER OF [TREBLE] DAMAGES";** (included in the 19 pages)
- 3) **"NOTICE OF 'CLAIM OF APPEAL' FOR THE REASONS CITED ABOVE AND BASED UPON 'OVERRIDING AND PALPABLE ERRORS' AND GROSS OMISSIONS OF FACTS; AND INTENTIONAL [TORTUOUS] VIOLATIONS OF THE 'RULES ENABLING ACT'"** (included in the 19 pages)
- 4) This instant **PROOF OF SERVICE** (1 page)

Truthfully submitted,

/s/ David Schied

Date: 8/6/21

2) PRIVATE, PUBLIC PROXY David Schied's 72-page, fully supported "CLAIM AND APPEAL" With "DEMAND FOR FEDERAL SPECIAL GRAND JURY INVESTIGATION (under 18 USC §3332)" for this very case, as located in this ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD located at:

http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/091021_Schied_BriefonCLAIMandAPPEAL-ALL.pdf

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

David Schied, one of the *Sovereign American People* recognized by the U.S. CONSTITUTION; a totally and permanently disabled *RECENT QUAD-AMPUTEE; CRIME VICTIM; Common Law and Civil Rights *sui juris* GRIEVANT / CLAIMANT / BENEFICIARY "BENEFICIARY" / RELATOR*

**Court of Appeals
21-2809**

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al

recognized now widely as a "*Federal Corporation*" masquerading as an Administrative ("*Fourth Branch*") State and ARTICLE III "*constitutional*" fixture "*of, by and for The American People*"
"CO-TRUSTEES"

**On CLAIM and APPEAL
from the USDC-SDWD
Civ. No. 21-5030
JUDGE: Lawrence Piersol**

**With DEMAND FOR
FEDERAL SPECIAL
GRAND JURY
INVESTIGATION
(under 18 USC §3332)**

From: ca08ml_cmecl_notify@ca8.uscourts.gov

To: deschied@yahoo.com

Date: Monday, September 13, 2021, 12:32 PM MDT

NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing.

Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals

Notice of Docket Activity

The following transaction was filed on 09/13/2021

Case Name: David Schied v. United States, et al

Case Number: 21-2809

Document(s): Document(s)

Docket Text:

BRIEF FILED - APPELLANT BRIEF filed by Mr. David Schied. w/service 09/13/2021, Length: 12,997 words
The court has received and filed appellant's brief. Because no briefing schedule has been established, the appellant's brief is premature. Until a briefing schedule is established, no appellee responsive brief is due at this time.

[5075684] [21-2809] (NDG)

Statement of the Case

BENEFICIARY-RELATOR David Schied – a recently (2018) totally and permanently disabled American man was – as a matter of unrebutted fact that the Court is obligated to “*liberally construe and assume as true*” and “*examined for relief on any possible theory*” – was transformed into a quad-amputee as a result of an attempted murder by STATE OF MICHIGAN and NATIONAL government agents working with CORPORATE licensees in a circumstantially well-documented but covert criminal RICO enterprise.

Subsequent to PRIVATE, PUBLIC PROXY David Schied becoming rendered a biological “*quad-amputee*”, the named CO-TRUSTEES continued their preceding near seventeen (17) year documented history of “*government whistleblower retaliation*”, by engaging in a coordinated and multi-tiered “*domestic terrorist network*” and continuing to “*target*” SUI-JURIS David Schied for further Seditious and Treasonous acts of terrorism.

This latest mechanism for insurrectionism and terror – the same as all of the preceding “*Backward-Looking Access-To-Court*” cases – was carried out by STATE BAR OF MICHIGAN members inflicting a malicious and tortuous EVICTION during a national COVID pandemic and federally legislated EVICTION MORATORIUM. Similarly, these predicate criminal RICO acts were “*affirmatively*” covered up at the secondary levels, by both the “*Executive*” and “*Judicial*” BRANCHES of STATE and NATIONAL governments through various criminal acts, including the failure and/or the refusal to act when called upon to perform their Fiduciary Duties under the

Constitutions of the STATE and the UNITED STATES as sworn by Oath to "faithfully perform".

In effort to seek proper examination and relief upon report of the facts about these multi-tiered crimes crossing multiple jurisdictions, BENEFICIARY-RELATOR David Schied filed his "*case*" in the federal courts – TWICE – once in the USDC-EDM before being evicted, and then again after eviction once he found what he initially believed to be *refuge* from homelessness in the STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA in the jurisdiction of the USDC-SDWD.

The first case filed in the USDC for the EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN (SOUTHERN DIVISION in DETROIT) was the "*removal*" of the EVICTION case to the federal jurisdiction, which was assigned to Victoria Roberts, the former STATE BAR OF MICHIGAN president and vice-president and federal "*judge*" of the USDC-EDM as named "*CO-TRUSTEES*" in this case, by which the principal CO-TRUSTEE initiating the eviction proceedings was also a long time member. This first case filing on 1/5/2021 was based upon Petitioner's proof of Declaratory compliance with the NATIONAL EVICTION MORATORIUM levying both civil and criminal penalties for violators like the named CO-TRUSTEES of this case.

The second of these many multi-tiered and complex "*inexplicably intertwined*" cases, filed in the WESTERN DIVISION of the DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA and assigned to federal "*judge*" Lawrence Piersol was a "*whistleblower*" case. It contained the fuller, lengthy, near two-decade background inclusive of the long accumulation of circumstances surrounding and underlying the attempted murder, the eviction, and the seventeen years of well-documented "*whistleblower history*" against STATE BAR

OF MICHIGAN corruption and the inequity of justice preceding these "eviction" events as *officially* documented in the STATE OF MICHIGAN and UNITED STATES court systems, which are otherwise mandated to be operating as "*constitutional*" fixtures and not instead as for-profit "*Continuing Financial Crimes Enterprises*".

Criminal allegations and claims against the "*domestic terrorists*" consisting of the usurpers of the offices of clerks, case managers, and judges of the Michigan Court of Appeals and Michigan Supreme Court, and similarly against those of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States, are supported by a plethora of documentation concerning numerous cases that I have pushed through these corrupted crime syndicates. The following is just a short list of example case numbers that can be verified:

- a) Washtenaw County Circuit Court - 04-000577-CL; (*Schied v. Sandra Harris et al*)
- b) Michigan Court of Appeals - 267023; (*Schied v. Sandra Harris et al*)
- c) Michigan Supreme Court - 131803; (*Schied v. Sandra Harris et al*)
- d) 3rd Judicial Circuit Court in the Charter County of Wayne - 06-633604-NO; (*NV School*)
- e) Ingham County Circuit Court - 07-1256-AW; (*Schied v. Jennifer Granholm et al*)
- f) Michigan Court of Appeals - 202804 and 282820; (*Schied v. Jennifer Granholm et al*)
- g) Michigan Supreme Court - 139162 (or it may have been 138162);
- h) United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan - 08-CV-10005;
- i) United States COA for the 6th Circuit - 08-1879 and 08-1895 and 08-14944;
- j) 3rd Judicial Circuit Court in the Charter County of Wayne - 09-030727-NO; (*NV + WC*)
- k) Michigan Court of Appeals - 303715 and 303802; (*NV + WC*)
- l) Washtenaw County Circuit Court - 09-1474-NO; (*Schied v. Williams + Lincoln Schools*)
- m) United States District Court for the EDM - 09-CV-11307 and 09-CV-12374;
- n) United States COA for the 6th Circuit - 10-10105;
- o) 3rd Judicial Circuit Court in the Charter County of Wayne - 10-109328-DM;
- p) Michigan Court of Appeals - 305591; (*Schied v. Schied - demand for grand jury*)
- q) 17th District Court for the Charter Township of Redford - 10B020893 OI; (*17th DC*)
- r) Michigan Court of Claims - 11-000050-MZ; (*Schied v. SCA, et al*)
- s) Michigan Court of Appeals - 306026 and 306801; (*Schied v. SCA, et al*)
- t) Michigan Supreme Court - 144426; (*Schied v. State Court Administrator, et al*)
- u) Michigan Supreme Court - 144456; (*Schied v. Township of Redford, et al*)
- v) Michigan Supreme Court - 144943; (*Schied v. Schied - demand for grand jury*)
- w) Michigan Supreme Court - 145027; (*Schied v. State Court Administrator, et al*)
- x) 3rd Judicial Circuit Court in the Charter County of Wayne - 11-004881-CP; (*Colombo*)
- y) 3rd Judicial Circuit Court in the Charter County of Wayne - 11-012316-AV; (*Curtis*)
- z) 3rd Judicial Circuit Court in the Charter County of Wayne - 11-014259-AW; (*Curtis*)
- aa) Michigan Court of Appeals - 306542; (*Schied v. Chart. Town. of Redford, et al*)
- bb) Michigan Court of Appeals - 307195 and 308715;
- cc) Midland County Circuit Court - 12-8792-AH; 12-8824-AH
- dd) 3rd Judicial Circuit Court (Charter County of Wayne) - 12-6699-AR; 12-6199-01-AR
- ee) Supreme Court of the United States - 11-5937;
- ff) Supreme Court of the United States - 11-5945;
- gg) Supreme Court of the United States - 11-6015;
- hh) United States District Court for the EDM - 12-CV-12791;
- ii) United States COA for the 6th Circuit - 12-1979;
- jj) Supreme Court of the United States - 12-10356;

These dual-STATE / UNITED STATES combined cases underscore nearly two decades of well-documented "*Greylord-style*" government corruption in the same region of the UNITED STATES that prompted much more than the documentary movie "*White Boy*" and the filing of other previous cases in the USDC-EDM which similarly attempted to also prove systemic racism, insurrectionism, and domestic terrorism as delivered against Donald Trump and the Sovereign American People as carried out through the unconstitutional operating of the 2020 ELECTIONS in SE Michigan.

The long line of inextricably intertwined "*government whistleblowing*" cases underscores the fact that the STATE OF MICHIGAN has long been at the forefront of "*selectively*" applying *Critical Race Theory*" and *Cancel Culture* to broaden the unauthorized and unconstitutional powers of the Ruling Elite of this "*federal district*" and "*federal circuit*" for this region of the American Nation.

These well-documented cases – by which long-time "*GRIEVANT/CLAIMANT*" David Schied has been registering and archiving the massively accumulating data under the Common Law in his own ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD – show clearly (as "*hindsight is 20/20*") that these, now going on eighteen (18) years of *mushrooming* crimes, are being carried out by STATE BAR members operating together as a massive CRIME SYNDICATE and DOMESTIC TERRORIST NETWORK, while otherwise masquerading as "*government*" and destroying the lives of both "*Black*" and "*White*" community members and their families, with the oversight permissiveness of the FBI and USDOJ operating throughout this region of the American nation, all at the expense of unwary Americans, many as "*Taxpayers*".

Such mounds of documentation has been entered into this case by reference, under the COMMON LAW, as an accumulation of websites brandishing the EVIDENCE of STATE BAR and AMERICAN BAR member corruption as carried out in past seventeen years of "whistleblower" history about the EXECUTIVE and JUDICIAL "branches" of the STATE and the UNITED STATES. Throughout these past nearly two decades of history, BENEFICIARY-RELATOR has reached for help all the way through the "*government*" hierarchy to the SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES on five (5) documented occasions, but persistently to no avail on requested Constitutional and Statutory remedies. The documentation for these four previous official "*PETITIONS*" to SCOTUS is too voluminous to be published in ten (10) copies at the expense of a declared "*forma pauperis*" litigant as SUI JURIS David Schied, as otherwise "*exclusively*" required by the SUPREME COURT RULES to "weed out" and "*deny access*" to certain types of so-called "*pro se*" litigants. Therefore, the documented EVIDENCE of these previous FOUR separate "*PETITIONS*" as cases – all previously DENIED by SCOTUS – can all be found today posted publicly in PRIVATE, PUBLIC PROXY David Schied's own ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD located at: https://www.ricobusters.com/?page_id=818

The SCOTUS cases – three of total four which were referenced by Lawrence Piersol in his fraudulent *Judgment / Opinion and Memorandum* [Doc. #14; page 17 (Page ID#824) of the USDC record] – are listed below. The first two of those three cases were filed in 2011 with SCOTUS as "*PETITION[S] FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI*" that were filed with a third case of "*PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS*" that for some conspicuous reason, Lawrence Piersol failed to mention

with his other GROSS OMISSIONS displayed by his fraudulent ruling(s) in 2021. The third case that he did mention was another "PETITION[S] FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI" filed by BENEFICIARY-RELATOR with SCOTUS in 2013. Below are summary explanations of each, along with web-links to both the original "public" filings and all of the "DENIALS" (of all the requested Certioraris and Mandamus) from SCOTUS.

- 1) David Schied v. Scott Snyder, Lynn Mossoian, Kenneth Roth, Richard Fanning, Jr., David Soebbing, Harvalee Saunto, Donna Paruszkiewicz, Mary Fayad, Susan Liebetreu, Donald Yarab, Catherine Anderle, Arne Duncan, in both their individual and official capacities, 565 U.S. 982 (2011) – SCOTUS Case #11-6015

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

<http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/3-10A1018-PET4WRITOFCERTIORARIAPPENDIX-StudentA.pdf>

SUPPORTING APPENDIX AND EXHIBITS OF EVIDENCE (569 pages)

<http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/APPENDIXforCertiorari-StudentAvSnyderetal-SCOTUSall-redct.pdf>

SCOTUS SUMMARY DENIAL –

http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/1-103111_CertiorariDENIED11-6015-Snyderetal-StudentA.pdf

- 2) David Schied v. Ronald Ward, Ken Hamman, Kirk Hobson, Patricia Meyer, Karen Ellsworth, Jessica Murray, Jennifer Bouhana, Patricia Ham, Joe Mosier, in both their individual and official capacities, 565 U.S. 1231 (2012) – Doc. #14; page 17 (Page ID#824) of the USDC record. SCOTUS Case #11-5937 ¹

This was a case of defamation and contract violation, as well as criminal racketeering covering a span of three years and onward to the present as none of these issues were ever "*litigated on the merits*", thus denying "*meaningful access to the court*" in the underlying case in which the "*DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL*" was DENIED.

¹ NOTE: The original filings for this SCOTUS case are believed to have gotten lost or destroyed over the years of moving and storage. All of the documents from the lower STATE and UNITED STATES courts have been located; and so too has the "PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION" by SCOTUS for all of these three cases filed in 2011 also been located as shown below.

3) *In Re David Schied*, SCOTUS Case #11-5945:

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/1-081511_Petition4WritofMandamus.pdf

SUPPORTING APPENDIX (OF EVIDENCE EXHIBITS):

http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/2-081511_APPENDIX4Petition4WritofMandamus.pdf

ACTUAL EXHIBITS (601 pages) OF EVIDENCE:

<http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/3-081511APPENDIX4WritofMandamusSCOTUS-ALL-Redct.pdf>

SCOTUS DENIAL –

<http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/103111-SCOTUSdenialofWRITOFMANDAMUS.pdf>

USDC-SDWD “*judge*” Piersol also GROSSLY OMITTED the FACT that there was a “*PETITION FOR REHEARING OF DENIAL*” of all of the above-referenced “*Certiorari*” and “*Mandamus*” petitions, as also filed with the SCOTUS in 2011. On first attempt, BENEFICIARY-RELATOR attempted to makes things simple using the same documents of EVIDENCE to support arguments about all three “*denied*” cases. These documents were sent – according to SCOTUS rules for “*forma pauperis*” filers, with ten (10) copies of each filing. That filing, complete with EXHIBITS OF EVIDENCE are accessible via the links below to this instant ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD.

<http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Petition-4-Rehearing-on-3-Cases-2011.pdf>

However, the “*Clerk of the Court*” William Suter sent all the documents back while demanding their resubmission with three times the paperwork and mailing costs. (See top of next page for the link to this “*rejection*” document.)

http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/122111_Letr2Resubmitin15daysbyWilliamSuter.pdf

Therefore, those separated “*PETITION(s) FOR REHEARING*” were all resent to SCOTUS – but again all three DENIED a second time by rehearing as follows, again being accessible by link to this instant ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD.

PETITION FOR REHEARING on PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS – In Re David Schied (SCOTUS Case No. 11-5945)
<http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/PET4REHEAR-InReDavidSchied-11-5945.pdf>

SCOTUS “2nd DENIAL” on Rehearing for WRIT OF MANDAMUS – In Re David Schied (SCOTUS Case No. 11-5945)
<http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/SCOTUSClerkDENIAL-noseal-InReDavidSchied-11-5945.pdf>

PETITION FOR REHEARING on PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI – Schied (on behalf of STUDENT A) v. Scott Snyder, et al (SCOTUS Case #11-6015)
<http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/PET4REHEAR-SchiedvScottSnyderetal-11-6015.pdf>

SCOTUS “2nd DENIAL” on Rehearing for WRIT OF CERTIORARI – Schied (on behalf of STUDENT A) v. Scott Snyder, et al (SCOTUS Case #11-6015)
<http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/SCOTUSClerkDENIAL-noseal-ScottSnyderetal-11-6015.pdf>

PETITION FOR REHEARING on PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI – David Schied v. Ronald Ward, et al (2011) (SCOTUS Case No. 11-5937)
<http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/PET4REHEAR-SchiedvWardetal-11-593710A1017.pdf>

SCOTUS “2nd DENIAL” on Rehearing for WRIT OF CERTIORARI – David Schied v. Ronald Ward, et al (2011) (SCOTUS Case No. 11-5937)
<http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/SCOTUSClerkDENIAL-noseal-WARDETAL-11-5937.pdf>

On 12/30/21, BENEFICIARY-RELATOR David Schied sent back to SCOTUS his separated “*PETITION(s)*”, again in duplicates of one for EACH case being

“**petitioned**” for “**rehearing**”; while also sending copies of each again to EACH of the government attorneys that he was then suing in 2011.

In his package to SCOTUS Clerk William Suter, SUI JURIS “Grievant/Claimant” not only sent the three separated “**PETITIONS**” presented below (by links), he also sent to SCOTUS – via “*Certified Mail Delivery*” by the USPS – a very important “**LEGAL NOTICE AND DEMAND**” which included a 26-paragraph “**STATUTE STAPLE SECURITIES INSTRUMENT**”, as well as 6 pages of legal “**DEFINITIONS**” for absolute clarity.

All of these documents were subject to 30-day review by SCOTUS as time to dispute or rebut the terms before this document went into permanent effect. This added document put the SCOTUS – as a “**principal**” for the UNITED STATES – on clear notice that, not only did BENEFICIARY-RELATOR “**not consent**” to being under any CORPORATE controlling “**UNITED STATES**” jurisdiction; but that BENEFICIARY-RELATOR was also placing NOTICE that all of his **CLAIMS OF DAMAGES** were “**in commerce**” (past, present and future), and that any silence by SCOTUS in response to this document was “**acquiescence**” in TACIT AGREEMENT with the terms of this NEW CONTRACT with the UNITED STATES.

This document has for the past ten (10) years served as the legitimate and contractual basis for BENEFICIARY-RELATOR now in 2021 CLAIMING an accumulated debt by the UNITED STATES to him of minimally \$918 BILLION (\$918,000,000,000.00) as of December 2021. The link to that document follows:

http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/122411_CommonLawLegalNoticeDemand.pdf

In addition, BENEFICIARY-RELATOR sent to the SCOTUS “*Clerk*” – via “*Certified Mail via USPS*” a COVER LETTER fully explaining his intent to place the UNITED STATES “*on notice*” that I was One of the Sovereign People NOT “*subject to*” FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT “*citizenship*” slavery to the “*UNITED STATES*” CORPORATION; and that his CLAIMS OF DAMAGES (past, present, and future) were subject to heavy CONTRACT fees for CONSTITUTIONAL violations of his inalienable Rights as a sovereign.

BENEFICIARY-RELATOR included also a three (3) page cover letter accompanying and explaining the “LEGAL NOTICE AND DEMAND” and accompanying “STATUTE STAPLE SECURITIES INSTRUMENT”. Note that “*PROOF OF CERTIFIED MAIL DELIVERY*” on 1/4/12 was also included with this document, as all located in this ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD at the link below:

http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/010412_ProofofDeliveryof122411CoverLetr2ResubmitLEGALNOTDEMAND.pdf

The FOURTH PREVIOUS CASE before SCOTUS (*see below*) was already fraudulent as it appeared on the DOCKET as this fraud was perpetrated by the CLERK OF THE COURT, William Suter. The spelling went from “Gerald Nielson” (as originally filed in the lower “*U.S. DISTRICT COURT*”) to “*Jerry Nelson*” (as it was being “*DENIED*” by USDC-EDM “*Chief Judge*” Denise Page Hood) by means of a criminal conspiracy between this “*judicial usurper*” (Hood) and “*Clerk of the Court*” (Lewis) to commit an “*OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE*” while **tainting** the official record to provide “*comfort and safe harbor*” to the MIDLAND COUNTY SHERIFF Gerald Nielson by hiding his actual name from all future court records.

Notably, Gerald Nielson “*retired*” from his Office, just after this case was initially filed, at the end of 2012. Importantly, at each successive level of “*APPEAL*” to the SIXTH CIRCUIT and to the U.S. SUPREME COURT, whereby BENEFICIARY-RELATOR David Schied attempted to “*correct the record*” by spelling “*Gerald Nielson*” correctly on my cover sheets, the “*clerks*” as “*secondary*” level “*RICO*” racketeers changed the name back fraudulently to “*Jerry Nelson*” to uphold the “*predicate*” RICO CRIMES OF FRAUD committed by Denise Page Hood and her criminal accomplices of her “*lower court*” DOMESTIC TERRORIST NETWORK. (The proof of all this is in the EVIDENCE, as linked below.)

4) *David Schied v. MIDLAND COUNTY SHERIFF Gerald Nielson*, 571 U.S. 846 (2013) – Doc. #14; page 17 (Page ID#824) of the USDC record. SCOTUS Case #*12-10356*

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

<http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/1-SchiedKrausvGeraldNielson-PET4CERTIORARI-12-10356.pdf>

SUPPORTING APPENDIX AND EXHIBITS OF EVIDENCE (352 pages)

<http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/2-APPENDIXOFEXHIBITS-12-10356-ALL1-15.pdf>

EVIDENCE OF SCOTUS DOCKETING FOR SUMMARY DENIAL –

<http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/4-SCOTUS-CERTIORARISchedule-p25-SchiedKrausvGeraldNielson-12-10356.pdf>

The FACT is that these above-captioned cases before the SCOTUS, and the preceding “*Backward-Looking Access-To-Court*” STATE OF MICHIGAN and UNITED STATES cases described by these SCOTUS cases – for “*Writs*” of “*Certiorari*” and for “*Mandamus*” – provided overwhelming EVIDENCE that such DENIAL of *meaningful access* had occurred in at least a dozen other inextricably intertwined “*whistleblower-related*” cases filed by BENEFICIARY/RELATOR

against various MUNICIPAL, STATE, and UNITED STATES governments “*usurpers*” between 2004 and 2013, in cases involving both the EXECUTIVE and JUDICIAL branches.

In each case, the *pattern and practice* has been the same: STATE and UNITED STATES “*law enforcement*” – including BAR member “*prosecutors*” and *attorneys general* – abused their discretion in affirmatively refusing to prosecute reported crimes committed by other BAR members as private attorneys and public attorneys general and judges; while BAR member magistrates and judges affirmatively refused to provide *meaningful* access to courts, refused *litigation on the merits*, and refused *constitutional* access to Juries and Grand Juries of the People themselves as brought forth by *good faith* requests and subsequently demanded by SUI JURIS “*Grievant/Claimant*” in so-called “*Civil*” cases filed in STATE and UNITED STATES courts under the STATUTORY LAWS.

The FACTS about all those cases these past two decades – even as there have been other more recent cases filed in 2015-2016 and 2020-2021 – have created a perpetual “*Catch-22*” circumstance in which there has been the “*targeting for crimes*” against GRIEVANT/CLAIMANT David Schied, and accompanying DAMAGES caused to PRIVATE, PUBLIC PROXY David Schied – as well as the damages to the *Sovereign American People at large* – being repeated and compounded.

Moreover, this litany of “*Backward-Looking Access-To-Court*” cases and the continuing pursuits of “*just remedy*” and access to a Jury for constitutionally prosecuting NEW incidents or occurrences of “*civil*” CLAIMS – and access to a Grand Jury for constitutionally prosecuting “*criminal*” INDICTMENTS – leaves no options

RELATOR David Schied had filed his first "*Federal*" case naming three (3) SIXTH CIRCUIT "*judges*" (Martha Daughtrey, David McKeague, Gregory Van Tatenhove) and multiple FBI and USDOJ agents under the Eric Holder and Robert Mueller EXECUTIVE BRANCH of the OBAMA ADMINISTRATION.²

The second of these two more recent "*Backward-Looking Access-To-Court*" cases was "*blowing the whistle*" on the high levels of government corruption of the UNITED STATES "*district courts*" and EXECUTIVE BRANCH "*servants*", and has resulted in yet another compounded "*tier*" with a long line of documentation proving that there are no "*constitutional*" guarantees whatsoever operating in favor of the sovereign People – at least in this "*SIXTH CIRCUIT*" region of America – and perhaps throughout the Union of Continental United States of America.

What is revealed by the presentation of many years of well-organized "*official*" date-stamped "*court-entered*" documentation on the referenced BENEFICIARY-RELATOR's own "*ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD*" websites, is the FACTUAL EVIDENCE to underlie the "*intent*" behind both the ATTEMPTED MURDER and the subsequent EVICTION and homelessness of BENEFICIARY-RELATOR David Schied, giving "*just cause*" for PRIVATE, PUBLIC PROXY David Schied to be filing yet another federal case in the WESTERN DIVISION OF SOUTH DAKOTA.

² See David Schied v. Martha Daughtrey; David McKeague; Gregory Tatenhove; Stephen Murphy; Terrence Berg; Rod Charles; Andrew Arena; Margaret Love; Michael Mukasey; Maria O'Rourke; and Shanetta Cutlar as cited by Lawrence Piersol, also in Doc.14, p.13, Page ID #820, as "Schied v. Daughtrey, 2008 WL 5422680 (E.D. MI. 2008); Schied v. Daughtrey, 2009 WL 818095 (E.D. MI. 2009); Schied v. Daughtrey, 2009 WL 369484 (E.D. MI. 2009)

The history of this most recent case proves an “*obstruction of justice*” by the Clerk of the Court Matthew Thelen – who is the CO-TRUSTEES’ “agent of service” and “legal representative” according to the “appeals court” Clerk Michael Gans – from the onset of the first case filing. The case then was relegated to Lawrence Piersol, the politically-slanted FEDERAL JUDGES ASSOCIATION “*progressivist federal judge*”, who committed PERJURY OF OATH and at least the “*appearance*” of “*bad behavior in office*” when *dismissing* every single “*Count*” of that case, against all of the “*CO-TRUSTEES*”, while awarding “*blanket immunity*” to all named government officials “*under color of law*”, without any litigation whatsoever, and while even blocking the *forma pauperis* “*motions*” enabling service of SUMMONS and COMPLAINTS upon the named CO-TRUSTEES by the U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE.

The EVIDENCE in the record shows that both Victoria Roberts and Lawrence Piersol are agents of the FEDERAL JUDGES ASSOCIATION (“FJA”) – and though they are each operating from two distinctly different federal “*U.S. Districts*” – were nevertheless acting jointly in this case under the “*foreign power*” and *foreign legal protection* of the INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF JUDGES (IAJ), which itself operates as a “*foreign state*”, the UNITED NATIONS, and follows a “*foreign constitution*” totally independent of the “*enunciated*” DUTIES owed to the People by these “*judges*” under ARTICLE III of the U.S. CONSTITUTION, as they are otherwise paid by American “*TAXPAYERS*” to uphold and obey.

Because these entities of the FJA and IAJ follow a very different (international) “*CONSTITUTION*” and “*appear*” to rely upon very different “*statutes*”, very different “*delegated duties and responsibilities*”, very different

“allegiance” and reciprocal “guarantees” and “enforcement” of the “rights” of judges – different than what the Sovereign People of America have outlined in ARTICLE III of the “*Supreme Law of the Land*” – there is at least the resulting “appearance” of a “silent coup” against the sovereign People of the United States of America and the U.S. CONSTITUTION. This constitutes both a coercion of STATE and UNITED STATES “governments” and a coercion of State and American “populations”, as is defined by CONGRESS, the U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, and the FBI/USDOJ as “*domestic terrorism*”.

Yet, under the U.S. CONSTITUTION, the juxtaposed “*Balance of Powers*” of **ALL THREE BRANCHES** over “*law enforcement*” – provide each with the power and the DUTIES to “*replace*” rogue or “*activist*” judges (Judicial), to conduct “*impeachment*” of seditious or treasonous judicial “*usurpers*” (Legislature), and/or to order “*criminal investigations*” for RICO violations, insurrection and domestic terrorism (Executive). Yet, **all refuse to carry out these DUTIES**.

Instead, **all affirmatively “acquiesce in silence”** as this “*silent coup*” takes place (as done in this case by the EIGHTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS at the “*secondary*” RICO levels and by the U.S. PRESIDENT and CONGRESS at the “*predicate*” RICO levels); and/or **they engage affirmatively in *outright fraud***.

Indeed, FRAUD was the “*modus operandi*” in this instant case, as carried out in conspiracy fashion by the U.S. DISTRICT COURT “*judge*” and “*clerk*” at the secondary RICO levels; and by the CO-TRUSTEES named as BAR attorneys and other STATE agents at the predicate RICO levels). “*The Accused*” perpetrators continually “*rule*” and “*act*” as if the Sovereign People have no power – and even “*no*

legitimate interest – in the prosecution or non-prosecution of another “*person*”; whether the “*person in question*” is a “*natural*” person created by God, or a CORPORATE “*fiction*” created by the (DEEP) STATE.

Since that “*discretionary*” power alone is being deemed only by judges to reside only with STATE and UNITED STATES *prosecutors*, these judges are propagating a proven falsity and a public fraud in spite of the COMMON LAW and the *prima facie* terms of the organic Constitution of the United States for the People of the United States of America, particularly as cited in the NINTH and TENTH AMENDMENTS. This constitutes “*bad behavior*” outside the legitimate “*office*” and “*duties*” of FIDUCIARY judges who knowingly and willing are waiving any and all forms of “immunity” under America’s CONSTITUTION and UNITED STATES codified laws legislated under that “*PUBLIC TRUST*” compact between “*States*” of the UNION.

Further, because these *bad “administrative” behaviors* are both nonjudicial and unconstitutional, these tortuous actions – barring, by proven “*pattern and practice*”, any form of reasonable remedy within the codified and statutory systems of the STATE and UNITED STATES – calls for private, Common Law remedies by the Sovereign American People themselves as provided by this case, through the PRIVATE, PUBLIC PROXY of David Schied, who has long been acting publicly in the “*role of government of, by, and for the People*” in his *SUI JURIS* capacity, and privately as “*BENEFICIARY-RELATOR*”.

The Common Law “*remedy*” being herein CLAIMED, has long been “*tracked*” by the very same documented records being referenced by the case. Hence, the CLAIM now herein is for \$918 BILLION + INTEREST – redeemable in “*lawful money*

on demand at the TREASURY DEPARTMENT OF THE UNITED STATES per 12 U.S.C. §411; with such claims having been well documented as directly associated with valid “debit-logs” and “Ledgers of Counts” as references. [See the link in the ORIGINAL “*COMPLAINT*” pp.268-269 and “*Constitutional Citation*” of the first “WRIT OF CORAM NOBIS” p.65, as located in the ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD at:

http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/021321_WritofErrorandCorbumNobis.pdf

and p. 10 of the second “*WRIT OF CORAM NOBIS*” published publicly at:

http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/080621_CORBUMNOBISDefaultNoticeofAppeal-2.pdf

Notably, “*judge*” Lawrence Piersol has acknowledged in his OPINION / MEMORANDUM (Doc. 14, page, Page ID #816) that *PRIVATE, PUBLIC PROXY* of David Schied “*has set up his own court to deal with such issues*” as a matter of undisputed FACT. Yet he – as well as Victoria Roberts – dismissed the entirety of each and every “*COUNT*” under the false pretense that he/they are acting in the capacity of ARTICLE III “*judge(s)*”. The EIGHTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS “*tribunal*” of Jane Kelly, David Stras, and Jonathan Kobes then upheld and supported that “*predicate*” criminal action with “*secondary*” fraud of a similar nature.

The FACT is that every one of these named “*judicial usurpers*” is seditiously operating something other than an ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD under the U.S. CONSTITUTION. Instead, they are treasonously diverting and railroading so-called “*federal*” cases into a separate, “FOREIGN (UNITED NATIONS) JURISDICTION” and “*arbitrarily and capriciously*” using a UNITED NATIONS

(“*HUMAN RIGHTS*”) TRIBUNAL to push “*Critical Race Theory*” and other MARXIST / SOCIALIST / ANARCHIST ideologies and political agendas. The FACTS supporting this contention are both simple and *prima facie* obvious as explained immediately below.

ALL OF “*THE ACCUSED*” JUDGES ARE MEMBERS OF THE FJA; AND THE FJA ITSELF IS – AS A MATTER OF FACT – A MEMBER OF THE IAJ OPERATING UNDER AN ENTIRELY “*FOREIGN*” CONSTITUTION, AND HEADQUARTERED IN ROME, ITALY UNDER A KNOWN COMMUNIST REGIME

Federal Judges Association
Executive Committee Meeting Notes
Telephone Conference Call
September 11, 2019

Participating: Judges Cynthia Rufe (President), Richard Clifton (President-elect), Karen Schreier (Secretary), J. Michelle Childs (Treasurer) and Executive Committee members: Malachy Mannion, Dan A. Polster, Patti Saris, Nannette Brown, Patty Shwartz and Marilyn Huff (immediate past president).

Also participating: Julianne Clark (MSP).

Absent: Charles Simpson, Lawrence Piersol, Leo Gordon and Leigh May.

Judge Rufe called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m. EDT by telephone

Financial Report- Treasurer Michelle Childs

An audit of FJA’s finances was completed and no deficiencies were noted. A balance sheet showing total assets of \$812,923.68 as of August 31, 2019 was provided to the Executive Committee.

We found results for Victoria Roberts in



VICTORIA A ROBERTS visited 4/13/10 8:30

Appointment number: U08543

Appt End: 5/24/10 23:59

Meeting Location: WH

Type of Access: VA

Total People: 526

Caller: SHASTI

Appt Made: 5/20/10 15:02

Last Entry Date: 5/20/10 15:02

Description: FEDERAL JUDGES
ASSOCIATION RECEPTION.

Appt Start: 5/24/10 8:30

Visitee : POTUS

Release Date: 08/27/2010 07:00:00
AM +0000

Federal Judges Association
Current Members by Circuit
as of 3/3/2021

Linda Vivienne Parker

Victoria A. Roberts

Gerald E. Rosen (Ret)

George Caram Steeh, III (Snr)

Arthur J. Tarnow (Snr)

United States District Court Western District of Michigan

Robert Holmes Bell

Hala Y. Jarbou

Robert James Jonker

Paul Lewis Maloney

United States District Court District of North Dakota

Daniel L. Hovland

Patrick A. Conmy

Ralph R. Erickson

Charles Bruno Kornmann

Jeffrey L. Viken

John B. Jones

Karen E. Schreier

Lawrence L. Piersol

Richard H. Battey

Roberto A. Lange

United States District Court for the District of Minnesota

See next page – This judge Ann Montgomery criminally “aided and abetted” the top tier of SUPERVALU, INC. get away with funding international terrorism.

Ann D. Montgomery

David S. Doty

Donovan W. Frank

James M. Rosenbaum

Joan N. Ericksen

John R. Tunheim

Michael James Davis

United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

Morris S. Arnold (Snr)

Duane Benton

Kermit Edward Bye (Ret)

Ralph R. Erickson

Jane L. Kelly

Jonathan A. Kobes

Michael J. Melloy (Snr)

Roger L. Wollman (Snr)

United States District Court Eastern District of Arkansas

Kristine Gerhard Baker

Susan Webber Carter (Snr)

Denzil Price Marshall, Jr.

Victoria Roberts is just one of very many FJA/IAJ agents operating as *Insurrectionists* and *Domestic Terrorists* at the EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN. Others include Paul Borman, Lawrence Zatkoff, Denise Page Hood, Stephen Murphy, Avern Cohn, Terrence Berg, & Sean Cox

International Association of Judges

Union Internationale des Magistrats

Pokizzo di Giustizia

Piazza Cavour - 00193 Roma, Italy

tel: +39 06 6883 2213 fax: +39 06 687 1195

Notably, although Italy was deemed a “democratic republic” after WWIL, recent decades have shown that the government was heavily influenced by the Communist Party until the time of the fall of the SOVIET UNION in 1991, at which point the Italian COMMUNIST PARTY split amidst a nationwide judicial investigation into the political corruption of the Italian PARLIAMENT that resulted in more than half of its members being indicted. “After that, the Italian Communist Party became the Democratic Party of the Left, a predecessor of today’s Democratic Party...” which is still considered one of the main four political parties of ITALY today.

419

 International Association of Judges
promoting an independent judiciary worldwide

MEMBER ASSOCIATIONS

LIST OF THE 87 NATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OR REPRESENTATIVE GROUPS

MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF JUDGES IN 2015/2016

• ALBANIA (Union of the Albanian Judges)

• ALGERIA (Syndicat National des Magistrats Algériens)

•

• UNITED KINGDOM (The British Section of the International Association of Judges)

• URUGUAY (Asociación de Magistrados Judiciales)

• USA Federal Judges Association

This is a page from the research document compiled by BENEFICIARY-RELATOR for this case, titled: ***“How and Why the Courts and Other ‘Branches’ of American Governance Got So Corrupted and Appear to Ignore the Constitutional Guarantees of the Public Trust”: A Compilation of the Works of Patriotic Journalists; with Additional Commentary and Evidence”***
by David Schied
http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Schied_HowandWhytheCourtsGotCorrupted-ALL-pw.pdf

UNIVERSAL CHARTER OF THE JUDGE

https://www.unodc.org/res/ji/import/international_standards/the_universal_charter_of_the_judge/universal_charter_2017_english.pdf



Federal Judges Association

federaljudgesassoc.org/section/subsection.php?structureid=25

FJA Officers and Board of Directors

2021

Executive Committee

Nannette Jolivette Brown, Chief USDJ, Eastern District

Robin S. Rosenbaum, USCJ, Court of Appeals

Mary S. Scriven, USDJ, Middle District of Florida

Lawrence L. Piersol, USDJ, District of South Dakota

Charles R. Simpson, III, USDJ, Western District of Ken

Patty Shwartz, USCJ, Third Circuit Court of Appeals

Leo M. Gordon, CITJ, Court of International Trade

Patty Shwartz, USCJ, Third Circuit Court of Appeals

Dan Polster, USDJ, Northern District of Ohio

Patti B. Saris, Chief USDJ, District of Massachusetts

Directors-At-Large

6th Circuit

James G. Carr, USDJ, Northern District of Ohio

Sean F. Cox, USDJ, Eastern District of Michigan

David Jason Hale, USDJ, Western District of Kentucky

Aleta Trauger, USDJ, Middle District of Tennessee

8th Circuit

Stephen Bough, USDJ, Western District of Missouri

Jane L. Kelly, USCJ, Court of Appeals

John M. Gerrard, Chief USDJ, District of Nebraska

Susan Richard Nelson, USDJ, District of Minnesota

ROBINS ■ KAPLAN LLP

REWRITING THE ODDS

District Court Dismisses Antitrust Suit Against SUPERVALU

Judge Finds No Evidence of Restrained Trade, Injury to Plaintiffs *January 2013*

MINNEAPOLIS (January 2013) – The U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota has issued a summary judgment order dismissing for lack of evidence a multi-district antitrust lawsuit against firm client SUPERVALU Inc. District Judge Ann D. Montgomery also refused to revisit her July 2012 decision to deny class certification in the case, again citing lack of evidence.

"We are pleased by this result for our client, which ends more than four years of litigation on a matter that was without merit from the start," said Robins, Kaplan, Miller & Ciresi L.L.P. partner Stephen P. Safranski, lead trial counsel to SUPERVALU.

The suit arose out of an antitrust challenge brought by several grocery retailers to a 2003 Asset Exchange Agreement between SUPERVALU and C&S Wholesale Grocers, Inc.

No. 09-CV-00913-JNE/SRN
v. Susan Richard Nelson
Gamut Control, LLC.
John McCormick
John Constantine Golfit
Plaintiff
v
REDACTED 3RD NAME
George Tuseau,
David Schied
Defendants

DEFENDANT DAVID SCHIED'S
MOTION FOR ENHANCEMENT OF ORDER TO ALLOW PLAINTIFFS "REDRESS OF DEFICIENCIES IN JURISDICTIONAL ALLEGATIONS"
AND
MOTION TO EXPEDITE RULING ON PREVIOUSLY FILED MOTIONS of Defendant
for "MOTION TO DISMISS" and MOTION FOR SANCTIONS TO BE APPLIED AGAINST PLAINTIFFS AND THEIR ATTORNEY, FOR CONTEMPT and for CRIMINAL FRAUD UPON THIS COURT"

David Schied – Pro Per
20073 Northville Place Dr.
North #3120
Northville MI 48167
John P. Brendel
Sylvia Ivey Zinn
Attorneys
8410 Panda Drive Blvd
Gregory A. Abbott
(205491) Attorney for
Plaintiffs Abbott Law
Office D C Bar 74245
199

TOP: This "judge" Ann Montgomery "fixed" a CLASS ACTION lawsuit against SUPERVALU, INC., allowing the CEO and other "Insiders" to get away with what was known in court records as the funding international terrorism. **BOTTOM:** "Judge" Susan Nelson helped cover up my exposing John Golfit's connection with SUPERVALU victimizing "federal whistleblowers".

... for American "federal" judges being the *CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES* *for the United States of America* that created "Article III" judges with conditional employment based exclusively upon "good behavior" and the power of the Senate (under Article 1, Section 3) "to try all Impeachments," including the impeachment of judges.]



International Association of Judges

promoting an independent judiciary worldwide

STATUTE



INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF JUDGES

CONSTITUTION

Article 1

1. The International Association of Judges is hereby established.
2. The seat of the Association is in Rome.

Article 2

The Association does not have any political or trade-union character.

Article 3

1. The objects of the Association are as follows:
 - (a) to safeguard the independence of the judicial authority, as an essential requirement of the judicial function and guarantee of human rights and freedom.
 - (b) to safeguard the constitutional and moral standing of the judicial authority.
 - (c) to increase and perfect the knowledge and the understanding of Judges by putting them in touch with Judges of other countries, and by enabling them to become familiar with the nature and functioning of foreign organizations, with foreign laws and, in particular, with how those laws operate in practice.
 - (d) to study together judicial problems, whether these are of regional, national or universal interest, and to arrive at better solutions to them.

2. These objects are to be pursued by the following means:

- (a) by the organization of conferences and meetings of Study Commissions.

What is inferred therefore, based upon this *evidence*, is that the "statutes," and all references by the **INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF JUDGES** to "Article III" does NOT relate to the *organic Constitution for the United States* or the 1871 "**CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES...**" or any other "*constitution*" except for the **CORPORATE "CHARTER" and CONSTITUTION** established and propagated by the private multi-national organization known as **INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF JUDGES**, on a page titled "**CONSTITUTION**" and inclusive of various "*Articles*" (including an "Article 3").

Importantly, the so-called “rights” depicted by the IAJ’s “*UNIVERSAL CHARTER OF THE JUDGE*” are different “rights” than are enunciated by the UNITED STATES under *ARTICLE III of the U.S. CONSTITUTION* (conditioned by the “*Good Behavior*” of ARTICLE III judges). Moreover, the U.S. CONSTITUTION provides CONGRESS with the right to impeach of federal judges. Yet, the INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION OF JURISTS (an affiliate of the INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF JUDGES indicates that – internationally – any threats to a judge’s (or even an attorney’s financial livelihood) can and will be met with international intervention.

Judges and Judicial Administration – Journalist’s Guide

uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judges-and-judicial-administration-journalists-guide

Federal Judges

Article III of the Constitution governs the appointment, tenure, and payment of Supreme Court justices, and federal circuit and district judges. These judges, often referred to as “Article III judges,” are nominated by the President and confirmed by the U.S. Senate. Article III states that these judges “hold their office during good behavior,” which means they have a lifetime appointment, except under very limited circumstances. Article III judges can be removed from office only through impeachment by the House of Representatives and conviction by the Senate. The Constitution also provides that judges’ salaries cannot be reduced while they are in office. Article III judicial salaries are not affected by geography or length of tenure. All appellate judges receive the same salary, no matter where they serve. The same is true for district court judges.



Centre for the Independence of Judges and Lawyers

Three main objectives

Accordingly, the main objectives of the ICJ's Centre for the Independence of Judges and Lawyers (CIJL) are:

- to advance the independence of the judiciary and legal profession to ensure that the administration of justice is carried out in full compliance with standards of international law;
- to promote the establishment of legal systems that protect individuals and groups against violations of their human rights; and
- to protect judges, lawyers and prosecutors who find themselves under threat.

“*Threat*” ??
of what?

Impeachment?

Being uncovered
as communists?

Being uncovered
as following
another
CONSTITUTION
?

Given that the EIGHTH CIRCUIT "*tribunal of judges*" consisting of Jane Kelly, David Stras, and Jonathan Kobes refused to litigate the matter – instead providing the *Clerk of the Court* with authority to act on their behalf to summarily "*uphold*" the unconstitutional acts of the lower court "*judge*", Certiorari is warranted herein for the Supreme Court's Review of its own extensive history of culpability for such "*bad behaviors*" by "*Federal*" judges in violation of both their FIDUCIARY Oaths and Duties of "*government service*" Offices.

ARGUMENT

What Lawrence Piersol has asserted about *PRIVATE, PUBLIC PROXY* of David Schied "*hav[ing] set up his own court to deal with such issues*" is a matter of undisputed FACT that is wholly justified below as follows, based upon ALL of the FACTS presented in the ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD for this instant case as it is inextricably intertwined with the "David Schied v. U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, ET ALIA" case. This "*official public record*" includes those many "*Backward-Looking Access-To-Court*" cases associated with the plethora of STATE and UNITED STATES cases previously "*filed*" but always "*summarily dismissed*" and DENIED proper Constitutional "*due process*" by way of also DENYING meaningful "*litigation on the merits*", as well as DENYING the provision of JURY and/or GRAND JURY as otherwise repeatedly demanded.

Courts are Bound to “*The Constitution*” as the “*Supreme*” Law and America’s “*Declaration of independence*” is the Indelible Reminder That When There is a “*Long Train of Abuses and Usurpations*” by Government, the People Have Both Right and Obligation to “*Alter or Abolish*” That Government, So to Re-Secure the Inalienable Rights of the *AMERICAN* People

The most recent nearly two decades of “*long train of abuses and usurpations*” have been meticulously documented as published openly by PH.D-level researcher and PRIVATE, PUBLIC PROXY David Schied as a legitimate “*Case Study*”. The location of most older of those files of SUPPORTING EVIDENCE have been, since 2009, posted at: <https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/>

While the vast majority of these files have been included in this case by reference to many tens of individually authenticated, sworn, and notarized Common Law AFFIDAVITS – which all remain totally unchallenged and unrebutted to date – the most recent of these meticulously documented “*long train of abuses and usurpations*” have been placed into the ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD for this case since its inception at the following PUBLIC web-location: ³

https://www.ricobusters.com/?page_id=342

³ NOTE: BENEFICIARY-RELATOR has a hierarchical structure that is different from that which the STATE and UNITED STATES courts typically use by “*pattern and practice*” for deleting, hiding, “*sealing*”, or otherwise “*striking*” important documents from the “*official*” record to hide the TRUTH in sequentially numbered filings – or even more simply by vaguely and archaically listing court actions in a “*docket sheet*” – to be made available to the public at large at a private cost.

Instead of following that fraudulent “*pattern and practice*” of these so-called “*government*” courts, PRIVATE PUBLIC PROXY David Schied’s ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD shows *good faith* compliance with the wide range of “*Court Rules*” and “*Rules of Procedure*” required in order for the Public Servants operating these “*U.S. Courts*” to be reasonably compelled to comprehend and “*file*” these documents into their own records; but while also providing public access to the “*entire record*” for a given case. Therefore, the public website provides numerous webpage links that branch out from the “*main*” page to alternative webpages that separate, explain, and keep clarity between each of the filings made available to the government “*courts*”. This is so that Sovereign American People who are not

Indeed, the research of many other People – as also selectively compiled by BENEFICIARY-RELATOR David Schied to support the Arguments herein – shows that the “*long train of abuses and usurpations*” had been occurring literally throughout the entirety of the Twentieth Century and across many U.S. Presidencies; particularly since the beginning of the CIVIL WAR when the Southern States historically *walked out* and leaving the U.S. CONGRESS *sine die*, and after the post-war assassination of Abraham Lincoln when began the RECONSTRUCTION ACTS, the reorganization of WASHINGTON, D.C. under a new “CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES”, and the FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT. The link to all of that research – captioned as immediately below – is intended to be located at:

http://www.ricobusters.com/?page_id=527 and captioned as:

“AMICUS IN TREATISE: INTERPRETING THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF FEDERAL AND NATIONAL GOVERNANCE OF THE PATRIOTIC ‘PEOPLE’ AND OTHER ‘FREE PERSONS’ INHABITING THE UNITED STATES”⁴

attorneys and judges, and who are not “*dues-paying*” members of the “*BAR*” and other CORPORATE “*associations*” such as WESTLAW, LEXIS NEXIS, PACER, as private enterprises operating “*for profit*” in COMMERCE, still have proper *access* (even if poor) and reasonable comprehension about the proceedings that occurred while interacting with government “*servants*”.

⁴ Whether or not the SCOTUS wishes to recognize this extensive research into this “*history of the United States*” as a true “*Amicus Curiae*” is irrelevant. This is yet another basis for PRIVATE, PUBLIC PROXY filing this case under the Common Law. In spite of BENEFICIARY-RELATOR David Schied being a “*totally and permanently disabled quad-amputee*” and a CRIME VICTIM, “*The Accused*” operating as “*officers of the court*” and as “*National Government*” have a long track record of refusing to recognize either. Further, BENEFICIARY-RELATOR knows that the SCOTUS can claim that SEPARATION OF POWERS does not subject the “*judiciary*” to legislation mandating governments and businesses to provide “*reasonable accommodations*” to the disabled. As history is a proper guide, there is a ninety-nine percent (99%) level of proven expectation that SCOTUS will DENY the document anyway, along with this entire case. Therefore, no “*Petition for Permission ...*” to enter this research as an “*Amicus Curiae*” into this ARTICLE III COURT OF

The other research, tracing “*the problem*” back even further to the BANK OF LONDON, to the INNS OF THE COURT, and the Euro-American Aristocracy going back to the ROMAN, BYZANTINE, VENETIAN, and other preceding world empires, is also captioned as:

“How and Why the Courts and Other ‘Branches’ of American Governance Got So Corrupted and Appear to Ignore the Constitutional Guarantees of the ‘Public Trust’”

This 526-page “*book*” is posted publicly in the ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD being herein also “*filed*” in the SCOTUS by SUI JURIS David Schied, as located at:

http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Schied_HowandWhytheCourtsGotCorrupted-ALL-pw.pdf

The location of the instant filings with SCOTUS is in the ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD, as of the date of this filing, at:

https://www.ricobusters.com/?page_id=818

RECORD is being sought from SCOTUS. It is already referenced by name and link as a public post, as a matter of this instant “*Certiorari*” document filing.

The U.S. CONSTITUTION Guarantees That the Fundamental Principles of the “Natural Rights of Man” are Inalienable; and That the Sovereign “States” Stay United by Unbreakable COMPACT to Guarantee That All Governments of These “United States of America” are Operating In Accord With the Sole Purpose of “Securing” These Natural and Inalienable “Rights of the People” – Equally – to Each and Every Individual

Whether SCOTUS “*justices*” and its hierarchy of other “*federal judges*” comprehend the significance of the CIVIL and CRIMINAL claims in this case and award one another and their fellow BAR members and other aristocracy various forms of immunity is irrelevant. What is important is that BENEFICIARY-RELATOR David Schied has picked up the mantle and the “*role of the government of, by and for the People*” and is, himself – SUI JURIS and in his Common Law capacity as PRIVATE, PUBLIC PROXY – prosecuting both “*civil*” and “*criminal*” CLAIMS on behalf of the sovereign *STATE* and as One of the Sovereign People in accordance with his Right to do so, as acknowledged by SCOTUS in the case of *Carol Anne Bond v. UNITED STATES*, 564 U.S. 211 (2011) as a “*TENTH AMENDMENT challenge*” (dismissal reversed and remanded because “*an individual may ‘assert injury from governmental action taken in excess of the authority that federalism defines’*”).

“*In our federal system, the National Government possesses only limited powers; the States and the people retain the remainder.*”

Creating a False Narrative For Implementing “Critical Race Theory” and Marxist Ideology of Racial and Gender “Equity” Against a Perceived “Privileged White Male” is an Abuse of Authority, Even as They are Carried Out Summarily by Judges to Promote “Fictional”, Unconstitutional, and “Foreign” Principals of “Social Justice” as Substitutes for “Litigation of the Merits” Based Upon “Real” Jury Trials and Grand Jury Indictments Where Government CORPORATIONS are “The Accused”

In this case, as in all others in this long history of *Backward-Looking Access-To-Court* cases, the “*Courts*” have carried out the very same Social-Marxist-Anarchist strategy now being exposed of the elitist professors at the America’s universities and the journalists in the mainstream media, in creating “*official*” narratives that run counter to the FACTS. (“*Let’s Go Brandon!*”) These false narratives have been constructed by “*activists*” BAR attorneys and FJA/IAJ judges alike – at both STATE and UNITED STATES levels – by much more than the “*appearance of impropriety*”.

Unilaterally changing the Constitutional fixtures of American “*government of, by, and for the People*” by such unscrupulous implementation of gross omissions of facts and misapplication of laws while denying both Juries and Grand Juries, constitutes CRIMES of *Sedition* and *Treason* for which only One of the Sovereign People can be best qualified to prosecute the intensity of this egregiousness. The most severe action any court can carry out in civil cases is that of denying any one of “*the People*” access to the Jury and Grand Jury of his “*peers*” of “*the People*”, while substituting the bent “*discretion*” of government officials bathed in “*immunity*” for the responsible prosecution of proven – by self-evident “*record*” of such deviant *pattern and practice* – malicious and tortuous *administrative* transgressions executed through self-interested, multi-tiered, *Insurrectionist* and *Domestic*

Terrorist activities as those presented herein as a “long train of abuses and usurpations”.

Those “BAR-Member Attorneys-Turned-Judges” Who Operate in America Under Influence of the British “INNS OF THE COURT”, and Who Likewise Follow a Very Different “CONSTITUTION” as Well as the “Foreign Policies” of the of the UNITED NATIONS – With the “FEDERAL JUDGES ASSOCIATION” Membership to the “INTERNATIONAL JUDGES ASSOCIATION” – at Least Exude the “Appearance of Bad Behavior” and Criminal Violation of the FOREIGN AGENT REGISTRATION ACT (“FARA”) of 1938

There is no question that each STATE of the United States of America is both “sovereign” and “foreign” to one another requiring CORPORATIONS to “register” and be “licensed” to do business in other STATES. So too the agencies of the NATIONAL GOVERNMENT are “foreign” to the STATES by their “DELEGATED” relationship with the FEDERAL GOVERNMENT of the “UNITED STATES” being the subordinate. Clearly, the UNITED STATES is not “sovereign” relative to the STATE GOVERNMENTS, but instead is wholly dependent upon the STATES’ “COMPACT” for its very existence. Therefore, they are “foreign” one another.

Thus, as shown further below in this *ARGUMENT*, it is both the STATES’ Right and the STATES’ Responsibility – by their creation of the UNITED STATES as a subservient “Federal government” – to ensure that all of its behavioral acts of both STATE and UNITED STATES “BAR member” attorneys and judges remain “constitutional” and that their acts are not unreasonably “unjust”, “excessive”, or “usurping” of the “enunciated” power the States have “delegated” to them as obligatory “officers of the court”.

This case – as well as all of the other nearly two decades of “*Backward-Looking Access To Court*” cases being presented herein by reference and inclusion of “*a preponderance of EVIDENCE*” – altogether shows that, time-after-time, both STATE and NATIONAL agents have thwarted both OATHS and DUTIES to “*Secure the [Natural and Inalienable] Rights of [All] the People*” as otherwise mandated by the “*Supreme Law of the Land*” – and as particularly reflected in the NINTH AMENDMENT – to act affirmatively when prompted to act upon this sole overriding purpose of government in America “*to secure the Rights of the People*”.

As such, as guaranteed to the People under the TENTH AMENDMENT – and as reaffirmed by the 2011 case of Carol Anne Bond v. UNITED STATES – any One of the People has the Right to pick up the sovereign mantle and the role of the “*government*” to appropriately alleviate and correct, even “*alter or abolish*”, tyrannical governments when it appears that those with the OATHS and the DUTIES to protect against such acts of *Sedition, Treason, Insurrection, and Domestic Terrorism*, as is described by this instant case, are supported by far more than *ample* EVIDENCE.

Clearly and openly, PRIVATE, PUBLIC PROXY David Schied has picked up that mantle before – in 2015-2016 – when acting as a “*PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL*” in the case of David Schied v. Karen Khalil, and the CHARTER COUNTY OF WAYNE, ET AL⁵. Having been, many times since that filing,

⁵ This federal case was referenced by Lawrence Poersol (Doc. #14, p.13; Page ID #820) as Schied v. Khalil, 2016 WL 4727477 (E.D. MI. 2016) and Schied v. Khalil, (R&R) 2016 WL 11472341 (E.D. MI. 2016).

criminally “*targeted*” and victimized – and therefore, TREBLED his persistently mushrooming original “*civil*” CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES in the amount of \$100 BILLION (plus interest) – BENEFICIARY-RELATOR now brings forth over \$918 BILLION in such CLAIMS on behalf of the People of the STATE OF MICHIGAN and the People of the UNITED STATES, by which SUI JURIS David Schied has a primary interest as a “*harmed party*” of these Sovereign People, as brought against the named “*CO-TRUSTEES*” of the STATE and the UNITED STATES in this instant case.

The UNDELEGATED Display of Power From Federal Judges Upholding Prosecutorial Abuses of Discretion – Whether at the STATE or UNITED STATES Levels – Erodes Legislative Power, Violates the CONSTITUTIONAL “*Separation of Powers*”, and Usurps the Sovereign Power and Responsibility of the STATES to NULLIFY Government Acts That Are Incongruent and Inconsistent With the “*Enunciated Duties*” Delegated by the States to the EXECUTIVE BRANCH to “*Take Care That the Laws [are] Faithfully Executed*”

The Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions (1798) maintained that it is the STATE(s)’ sovereign Right, as well as sovereign Responsibility to “*maintain and defend the CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, and the CONSTITUTION of [the] STATE(s), against every aggression, foreign or domestic*”; and that...

“*the several states who formed that instrument [of the U.S. CONSTITUTION], being sovereign and independent, have the unquestionable right to judge of its infraction; and that a nullification, by those sovereignties, of all unauthorized acts done under colour of that instrument, is the rightful remedy*”.⁶

⁶ These citations are primary sources published by the BILL OF RIGHTS INSTITUTE as enacted by the two STATES of Virginia and Kentucky in response to perceived overreach by the LEGISLATIVE BRANCH after the writing of the ALIEN AND SEDITION ACT (which was later REPEALED), as found on 12/6/21 located at: <https://billofrightsinstitute.org/primary-sources/virginia-and-kentucky-resolutions> :

“*These resolutions were passed by the legislatures of Kentucky and Virginia in response to the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798 and were authored by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, respectively. The*

The VIRGINIA RESOLUTION:

"RESOLVED, That the General Assembly of Virginia, doth unequivocably express a firm resolution to maintain and defend the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of this State, against every aggression either foreign or domestic, and that they will support the government of the United States in all measures warranted by the former."

Agreed to by the Senate, December 24, 1798.

The VIRGINIA RESOLUTION:

"RESOLVED, That this commonwealth considers the federal union, upon the terms and for the purposes specified in the late compact, as conducive to the liberty and happiness of the several states: That it does now unequivocably declare its attachment to the Union, and to that compact, agreeable to its obvious and real intention, and will be among the last to seek its dissolution: That if those who administer the general government be permitted to transgress the limits fixed by that compact, by a total disregard to the special delegations of power therein contained, annihilation of the state governments, and the erection upon their ruins, of a general consolidated government, will be the inevitable consequence: That the principle and construction contended for by sundry of the state legislatures, that the general government is the exclusive judge of the extent of the powers delegated to it, stop nothing short of despotism; since the discretion of those who administer the government, and not the constitution, would be the measure of their powers: That the several states who formed that instrument, being sovereign and independent, have the unquestionable right to judge of its infraction; and that a nullification, by those sovereignties, of all unauthorized acts done under colour of that instrument, is the rightful remedy: That this commonwealth does upon the most deliberate

resolutions argued that the federal government had no authority to exercise power not specifically delegated to it in the Constitution. The Virginia Resolution, authored by Madison, said that by enacting the Alien and Sedition Acts, Congress was exercising 'a power not delegated by the Constitution, but on the contrary, expressly and positively forbidden by one of the amendments thereto; a power, which more than any other, ought to produce universal alarm, because it is leveled against that right of freely examining public characters and measures, and of free communication among the people thereon, which has ever been justly deemed, the only effectual guardian of every other right.' Madison hoped that other states would register their opposition to the Alien and Sedition Acts as beyond the powers given to Congress."

reconsideration declare, that the said alien and sedition laws, are in their opinion, palpable violations of the said constitution; and however cheerfully it may be disposed to surrender its opinion to a majority of its sister states in matters of ordinary or doubtful policy; yet, in momentous regulations like the present, which so vitally wound the best rights of the citizen, it would consider a silent acquiescence as highly criminal. That although this commonwealth as a party to the federal compact; will bow to the laws of the Union, yet it does at the same time declare, that it will not now, nor ever hereafter, cease to oppose in a constitutional manner, every attempt from what quarter soever offered, to violate that compact:

AND FINALLY, in order that no pretexts or arguments may be drawn from a supposed acquiescence on the part of this commonwealth in the constitutionality of those laws, and be thereby used as precedents for similar future violations of federal compact; this commonwealth does now enter against them, its SOLEMN PROTEST.

Approved December 3rd, 1799.

True “Consent of the Governed” is Measured by “the Peoples” Obedience and Silence in Response to “Just” Power of Government; It is Not Based Merely Upon the Measure of Government “Status” and “Discretionary” Decision-Making Leaving Openings So Wide for Abuses That Truckloads of “Recorded” Criminal Activities Can Be Driven Through With “Immunity” Against Private and Public Claims of There Having Been Harm to “the People”

The “self-evident truths” that have been repeatedly repudiated by the named CO-TRUSTEES of this case, as well as all of the other previous “Backward-Looking Access-To-Court” cases have been reasonably documented, organized, and presented as a matter of this instant ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD, for purposes of formalizing JURY TRIAL(s) and GRAND JURY PROCEEDING(s). Under the Constitution as the COMPACT between the STATES for forming the “Federal Government” of the UNITED STATES in the first place, David Schied – acting in his SUI JURIS status as PRIVATE, PUBLIC PROXY for the “STATE(s)” has every power of authority granted to both prosecutors (Executive) and judges (Judicial), so long as

he acts constitutionally as the Sovereign to re-secure the STATE Rights – and enforce the STATE Responsibilities – of “*Securing the (Inalienable) Rights of the People*”.

The “*rights*” of judges and prosecutors will never take precedence over the Rights of EACH and EVERY Sovereign American, even if these public “*servants*” hold extended memberships in the INTERNATIONAL JUDGES ASSOCIATION of the UNITED NATIONS through the FEDERAL JUDGES ASSOCIATION.

The fact is that there is nearly twenty years of proven Records in this case demonstrating an unauthorized “*expansion of power*” of the “*Judiciary*” that rivals the similar unauthorized expansion of the “*Presidency*” during the OBAMA ADMINISTRATION by the “*abuse of prosecutorial discretion*” exemplified by the “[Attorney General Eric] HOLDER MEMORANDUM” of August 2013, which violated the “Take Care Clause” (ART. II, § 3) of the Constitution ⁷, effectively constituting an impermissible “*second veto*” by the President by selectively choosing which category of laws will and will not be “*faithfully executed*”, and for or against whom. ⁸

⁷ The Clause appears to at least charge the President with the supervision of executive branch members who enforce the laws. *See, e.g.*, Robert J. Delahunty & John C. Yoo, Dream On: The Obama Administration’s Nonenforcement of Immigration Laws, The DREAM Act, and the Take Care Clause, 91 Tex. L. Rev. 781, 781–83 (2013); George F. Will, *Obama’s Extreme Use of Executive Discretion*, Wash. Post, Dec. 18, 2013, available at http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/george-will-obamas-extreme-use-of-executive-discretion/2013/12/18/656ae4be-680d-11e3-ae56-22de072140a2_story.html ; Enforcing the President’s Constitutional Duty to Faithfully Execute the Laws Before the H. Comm. on the Judiciary, 113th Cong. 2 (2014) (statement of Rep. Goodlatte, Chairman, H. Comm. on the Judiciary). Even Justice Scalia joined in the debate. In his dissenting opinion in Arizona v. United States, 132 S.Ct. 2492 (2012), he referenced the DREAM Act and criticized the executive branch for selectively invoking “*enforcement priorities*” and resource scarcity to change policy. *Id.* at 2521 (Scalia, J., dissenting).

⁸ *See also*, Zachary S. Price, Enforcement Discretion and Executive Duty, 67 Vanderbilt Law Review 671 (2014) as it is available at:

CONCLUSION AND REMEDY

Without any doubt, the FACTS of this case show that both STATE BAR attorneys and FEDERAL JUDGES ASSOCIATION member "judges" in particular are engaging in "*Cancel culture*" and "*Critical Race Theory*" policymaking across the STATE OF MICHIGAN and the UNITED STATES. On a personal level, BENEFICIARY-RELATOR David Schied began meticulously documenting the CRIMES against him – being committed by "*government officials*" solely for political "*union busting*" and "*racial equity*" purposes – in 2003. The narrative of that story history, complete with embedded EVIDENCE, is posted publicly in the ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD at:

http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/111620_Letter2ProvostCanadaAA_SANDRAHARRIS-ALL.pdf

This "*Cancel culture*" and "*Critical Race Theory*" policymaking activity – as reflected on the national scale through the constructive of FALSE NARRATIVES about American History in spite of the merits of obvious FACTS – is not only being echoed in word and deed by the BIDEN PRESIDENTIAL ADMINISTRATION, but also by the UNAMERICAN "*members*" of the FOREIGN and CORPORATE

<https://scholarship.law.vanderbilt.edu/vlr/vol67/iss3/2> . "Treating this new reality of inevitable nonenforcement as establishing a new constitutional norm of unbounded executive discretion...would be a mistake. A law enforcement system predicated on unrestricted enforcement discretion would defy the text, history, and normative underpinnings of the Constitution" ... [Thus, risking] "the other two branches...acquiescing] in such discretion to a degree that should alter proper constitutional interpretation" ... Nevertheless, the constitutional principle of congressional primacy in lawmaking requires executive officials to focus on effectuating statutory policies rather than undermining them through nonenforcement.

"international states" paying homage to and maintaining superintending allegiance to the UNITED NATIONS.

This is a world movement based upon international "*Human Rights*" and not necessarily "*Constitutional guarantees*", designed for purposes of instilling racial and gender "*equity*" to what are perceived by some as "*underrepresented and marginalized*" populations; and necessitating powerful global alliances to remedy this "*problem*", which is often attributed to a long history of Anglo-Saxon European, British, and American **CORPORATE** colonialism and **Elitist** power dominance throughout Judeo-Christian Western Civilization, which too frequently excluded Muslims, Indigenous Natives, and other "*non-white*" and/or "*non-Western*" cultures and civilizations – but only so long as they were **NOT** part of the World's Most Wealthy aristocracy.

On the global scale, the U.N. may be a good thing; however, in America where the U.S. CONSTITUTION reigns "*Supreme*" in binding all judges, attorneys, and indeed, all government "*servants*" by OATH and DUTIES to the "*Several States*" and the Sovereign People inhabiting those "*United States of the America*", there is no other measure of judging or remedying the behaviors of those entrusted with fiduciary powers than under the enunciated terms of this "*Great Compact*" of the "*Public Trust*".

Yet, the FACTS and EVIDENCE have clearly shown that both "*prosecutors*" and "*judges*" alike have been grossly ignoring and misinterpreting the laws of the STATE(s) and UNITED STATES, so to substitute and "*cancel out*" the individual Rights, Freedoms, and Sovereignty of individual American People; and doing so in

MARXIST/SOCIALIST/ANARCHIST political fashion, purportedly "for the greater good" of the world, and for themselves. They are doing this through a subliminal but Seditious implementation of International Commerce and the UNITED NATIONS agenda ... pushing forward through the informed resistance of the American People, even if it means Treasonously using, insurrectionist coercion and "domestic terrorist" tactics against Anglo-American "Constitutionalism". This activity is similar to how the post-Civil War RECONSTRUCTION ACTS created social and political changes in the government of the Southern States "*at the point of a bayonet*", and by way of outright fraud in the feinted "*ratification*" of the subsequent FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT and SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT.

By January 2012, the SCOTUS and SIXTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS had both been provenly "*served*" with SUI JURIS David Schied's formal "LEGAL NOTICE AND DEMAND" which included a 26-paragraph "STATUTE STAPLE SECURITIES INSTRUMENT" setting forth clear "*TERMS OF AGREEMENT*" that, under the Common Law and COMMERCE, the DAMAGES to which the "*DEEP STATE*" of the UNITED STATES was unconstitutionally committing carried a hefty "*price tag*", and as has been the Seditious and Treasonous "*pattern and practice*", both "agents" and "principals" of the UNITED STATES have totally acquiesced to those terms this past full decade, in *TACIT AGREEMENT*.

The FACTS and EVIDENCE presented in this case and in the long history of preceding "*Backward-Looking Access-To-Court*" cases, also convey the full "accounting ledger" of insurmountable damages that have resulted from the affirmative refusals of these STATE and UNITED STATES attorneys, "*prosecutors*,"

and "*judges*" to carry out their unconstitutional "*bad behaviors*" without registering their "*foreign*" international and aristocratic status under the legislative requirements of the FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT. This is even in tortuous spite of the FACT that these damages have been shown repeatedly to rise privately against BENEFICIARY-RELATOR and many others as compounded base factors, and publicly against all Sovereign Americans and unwary "*Taxpayers*" otherwise believing themselves to be supporting the "*Constitutional Republic*" for which the U.S. FLAG ("Old Glory") still stands.

Many more Americans are only now beginning to "*wake up*" to the true fact that these attorneys, "*prosecutors*," and "*judges*" are secretly redirecting *U.S. Taxpayer funding* instead toward UNITED NATIONS *Human Rights* and racial/gender *equity* agendas based upon FALSE NARRATIVES, perverse "*discrimination*" against "*white Americans*" like BENEFICIARY-RELATOR David Schied, and the political implementation of combined Marxism, Socialism, Feminism, and Anarchism across America.

The CLAIM OF DAMAGES now in this case are incalculable; though justified by ledger amounts totally well over \$918 BILLION against the UNITED STATES alone; with many more in BILLIONS logged in this ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD against the "*STATE OF MICHIGAN, et alia*".

Judges have all along had "*Sua Sponte*" ability to do whatever they wished – "*in the interest of justice*" – to turn this situation around, rather than to add to ongoing defamation against PRIVATE, PUBLIC PROXY David Schied as a law-biding and patriotic American seeking alternatively BOTH appropriate Statutory

and proper Common Law remedies against this tortuous treatment. Instead of acting with "good behavior", as this case depicts, the "judges" have individually and collectively chosen the alternative of perpetuating the *Seditious* and *Treasonous* NARRATIVE, rather than to sanction and/or punish any of their "peer group" in this long history of their own aristocratic insolence and bastardizing of the actual, provable, and indisputable FACTS, even as placed in many scores of unrebutted AFFIDAVITS.

The choice has always been there for these STATE and UNITED STATES judges, as BENEFICIARY-RELATOR continues to exercise his own choice of exercising his Sovereignty on behalf of the STATE, and as One of the Sovereign People, against these very abuses of Enunciated and Delegated powers.

VERIFICATION: In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct based upon my personal knowledge. As the aggrieved party, UCC 1-102(2) Reserving my rights Without Prejudice UCC 1-308, I, David Eugene: from the family of Schied, am pursuing my remedies provided by [the Uniform Commercial Code] UCC 1-305. This AFFIDAVIT is subject to postal statutes and under the jurisdiction of the Universal Postal Union. No portion of this affidavit is intended to harass, offend, conspire, intimidate, blackmail, coerce, or cause anxiety, alarm, distress or slander any homo-sapiens or impede any public procedures, All Rights Are Reserved Respectively, without prejudice to any of rights, but not limited to, UCC 1-207, UCC 1-308. Including the First Amendment to The Constitution of the Republic of the United States of America. The affiant named herein accepts the officiate of this colorable court oath of office to uphold The Constitution; and therefore, is hereby accepted for value.

Truthfully submitted by,

/s/ David Schied – a "totally and permanently disabled quad-amputee"
BENEFICIARY-RELATOR
PRIVATE, PUBLIC PROXY
Sui Juris Grievant/Claimant

Executed on 12/15/21

