

## APPENDIX

APPENDIX 1.....	1
APPENDIX 2.....	4
APPENDIX 3.....	14
APPENDIX 4.....	18
APPENDIX 5.....	19
APPENDIX 6.....	21
APPENDIX 7.....	52
APPENDIX 8.....	64
APPENDIX 9.....	89
APPENDIX 10.....	90
APPENDIX 11 .....	92

---

### APPENDIX 1

: COURT OF APPEALS 9/25/23 UNPUBLISHED EN  
BANC DECISION

FILED: September 25, 2023

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-1362 (1:09-cv-003479 -CCB)

YURI J. STOYANOV Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

RAY MABUS, Secretary of the Navy United States  
Department of the Navy; JAMES H. KING,  
Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head  
of Code 70; KEVIN M. WILSON. Individually and in  
his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 74 Carderock  
Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; DAVID L.  
MAYO, Individually and in his Official Capacity as  
the Head of Code 743 Carderock Division Naval  
Surface Warfare Center; MARK THOMAS,  
Individually and in his Official Capacity as BEO Chief  
and Commander of Code 00 Carderock Division Naval

Surface Warfare Center; DAVID CARON, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Assistant Counsel Code 39 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; JACK K. TEMPLETON, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 20 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare center; CATHERINE L. KESSMEIER, Individually and in her Official Capacity as Counsel of Code 004 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; KENETH R. GOLDMAN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 71 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; KENNETH I. FORMAN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 73 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; SAM HAN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 74 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; CIRO MINOPOLI, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 75 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; WILLIAM SNYDER, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 20 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; M. WADE, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 21 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; M. I. BABERICH, Individually and in her Official Capacity as Head of Code 64 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; BRUCE CROCK, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 741 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; WILLIAM MARTIN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 722 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; CHARLES R. REEVES, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Product Area Director of Code 09 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; L. MURPHY, Individually and in his Official

Capacity as Read of Code 22 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; DAVID WINTER, DR Former Secretary of the Navy U.S. Department of the Navy GARY ROGHEAD, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Chief of Navy Operations; ARCHER M. MACY, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Commander of NSWC; PAUL B. SULLIVAN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Commander of SEA 00; JEFFERSON BEAUREGARD SESSIONS III, Attorney General; ROBERT K. HUR, U. S. Attorney, U.S. Attorney; MARGARET LONG, Individually and in her Official Capacity as Administrative/Technical Specialist Code 39; GARY M. JEBSEN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 70; GARTH JENSEN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Deputy Head of Code 70; MIKE MULLEN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Chief of Naval Operations; ELAINE B. MCKINNEY, Individually and in her Official Capacity as Deputy EEO Chief Code 004; WAYNE WEIKERT, Individually and in her Official Capacity as the Head of Code 70; CHRIS D. MEYER, Individually and in her Official Capacity as EEO Chief and Commander of Code 00; JEROME CARRUBBA, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Security Manager of Code 03; NEACLESA ANDERSON, Individually and in her Official Capacity as General Counsel of Code 04; JOSEPH VIGNALI, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 7204; PAUL SHANG, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 707; SUN HAN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 74; ROBERT WINGO, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 7502; ROBERT KOLLARS, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head

of Code 7102; JAMES SHANNON, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Chief of NSWC; KEVIN M. MCCOY, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Chief of NAYSEA; GARY ROUGHHEAD, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Chief of Naval Operations; BARBARA REDINGER, Individually and in her Official Capacity as Security Manager Code 40; B. CAHILL, Ms., Individually and in her Official Capacity as Head of Workforce Relations Branch Code 39

Defendants - Appellees

ORDER The petition for rehearing en banc was circulated to the full court. No judge requested a poll under Fed. R. App. P. 35. The court denies the petition for rehearing en banc.

For the Court

/s/ Nwamaka Anowi, Clerk

P.S. The Fourth Circuit Panel's fraud was intentionally covered-up in the 9/25/23 fraudulent decision. The panel of the 4-th Circuit Court of Appeals in the 7/25/23 unpublished opinion deliberately misrepresented facts and intentionally omitted the Issue #1 (in the 3/30/23 appeal and in the Informal Brief), i.e. district judge Blake's final 3/17/23 order denying by fraud Petitioner's unopposed 3/10/23 "Motion for Federal Criminal Investigation into Fraud on the Court and the willful and persistent cover-up of crimes and criminals of organized crimes of 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023."

---

**APPENDIX 2**

: COURT OF APPEALS 7/25/23 UNPUBLISHED

DECISION

**FILED: July 25, 2023**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-1362 (1 :09-cv-03479-CCB)

YURI J. STOYANOV Plaintiff – Appellant V.

RAY MABUS, Secretary of the Navy, United States Department of the Navy, JAMES H. KING, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 70; KEVIN M. WILSON. Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 74 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; DAVID L. MAYO, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 743 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; MARK THOMAS, Individually and in his Official Capacity as BEO Chief and Commander of Code 00 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; DAVID CARON, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Assistant Counsel Code 39 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; JACK K. TEMPLETON, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 20 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare center; CATHERINE L. KESSMEIER, Individually and in her Official Capacity as Counsel of Code 004 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; KENETH R. GOLDMAN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 71 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; KENNETH I. FORMAN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 73 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; SAM HAN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 74 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; CIRO MINOPOLI, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 75 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; WILLIAM SNYDER, Individually and in his Official Capacity as

Head of Code 20 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; M. WADE, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 21 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; M. I. BABERICH, Individually and in her Official Capacity as Head of Code 64 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; BRUCE CROCK, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 741 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; WILLIAM MARTIN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 722 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; CHARLES R. REEVES, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Product Area Director of Code 09 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; L. MURPHY, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Read of Code 22 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; DAVID WINTER, DR Former Secretary of the Navy U.S. Department of the Navy GARY ROGHEAD, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Chief of Navy Operations; ARCHER M. MACY, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Commander of NSWC; PAUL B. SULLIVAN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Commander of SEA 00; JEFFERSON BEAUREGARD SESSIONS III, Attorney General; ROBERT K. HUR, U. S. Attorney, U.S. Attorney; MARGARET LONG, Individually and in her Official Capacity as Administrative/Technical Specialist Code 39; GARY M. JEBSEN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 70; GARTH JENSEN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Deputy Head of Code 70; MIKE MULLEN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Chief of Naval Operations; ELAINE B. MCKINNEY, Individually and in her Official Capacity as Deputy EEO Chief Code 004; WAYNE WEIKERT,

Individually and in her Official Capacity as the Head of Code 70; CHRIS D. MEYER, Individually and in her Official Capacity as EEO Chief and Commander of Code 00; JEROME CARRUBBA, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Security Manager of Code 03; NEACLESA ANDERSON, Individually and in her Official Capacity as General Counsel of Code 04; JOSEPH VIGNALI, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 7204; PAUL SHANG, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 707; SUN HAN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 74; ROBERT WINGO, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 7502; ROBERT KOLLARS, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 7102; JAMES SHANNON, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Chief of NSWC; KEVIN M. MCCOY, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Chief of NAYSEA; GARY ROUGHHEAD, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Chief of Naval Operations; BARBARA REDINGER, Individually and in her Official Capacity as Security Manager Code 40; B. CAHILL, Ms., Individually and in her Official Capacity as Head of Workforce Relations Branch Code 39

Defendants - Appellees

JUDGMENT In accordance with the decision of this court, this appeal is dismissed. This judgment shall take effect upon issuance of this court's mandate in accordance with Fed. R. App. P.41;

/s/ PATRICIA S. CONNOR, CLERK

UNPUBLISHED

P.S. The Fourth Circuit Panel's 7/25/23 decision is fraudulent. The panel of the 4-th Circuit Court of Appeals in the 7/25/23 unpublished opinion

deliberately misrepresented facts and intentionally omitted the Issue #1 (in the 3/30/23 appeal and in the 4/25/23 Informal Brief), i.e. district judge Blake's final 3/17/23 order denying by fraud Petitioner's unopposed 3/10/23 **"Motion for Federal Criminal Investigation into Fraud on the Court and the willful and persistent cover-up of crimes and criminals of organized crimes of 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023."**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-1362 (1 :09-cv-003479 -CCB)

YURI J. STOYANOV, Plaintiff Appellant, v. RAY MABUS Secretary of the Navy United States Department of the Navy; JAMES H. KING, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 70 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; KEVIN M. WILSON, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 74 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; DAVID L. MAYO, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 743 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; MARK THOMAS, Individually and in his Official Capacity as EEO Chief and Commander of Code 00 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; DAVID CARON, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Assistant Counsel Code 39 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; JACK K. TEMPLETON, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 20 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; CATHERINE L. KESSMEIER, Individually and in her Official Capacity as Counsel of Code 004 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; KENETH It GOLDMAN, Individually and in his Official Capacity

as Head of Code 71 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; KENNETH I. FORMAN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 73 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; SAM HAN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 74 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; CIRO M1NOPOLI, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 75 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; WILLIAM SNYDER, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 20 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; M. WADE, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 21 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; M. J. BABERICH, Individually and in her Official Capacity as Head of Code 64 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; BRUCE CROCK, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 741 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; WILLIAM MARTIN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 722 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; CHARLES it REEVES, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Product Area Director of Code 09 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; L. MURPHY, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 22 Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; DAVID WINTER, DR Former Secretary of the Navy U.S. Department of the Navy; GARY ROGI-IEAD, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Chief of Navy Operations; ARCHER M. MACY, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Commander of NSWC; PAUL H. SULLIVAN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Commander of SEA 00; JEFFERSON BEAUREGARD

SESSIONS III, Attorney General; ROBERT K. HUR, U. S. Attorney, U.S. Attorney; MARGARET LONG, Individually and in her Official Capacity as Administrative/Technical Specialist Code 39; GARY M. JEBSEN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 70; GARTH JENSEN, individually and his Official Capacity as Deputy Head of Code Z0; MIKE-MULLEN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Chief of Naval Operations; ELAINE B. MCKINNBY, Individually and in her Official Capacity as Deputy EEC) Chief Code 004; WAYNE WEIKERT, Individually and in her Official Capacity as the Head of Code 70; CHRIS O. MEYER, Individually and in her Official Capacity as EEC) Chief and Commander of Code 00; JEROME CARRUBBA, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Security Manager of Code 03; NEACLESA KNDERSON, Individually and in her Official Capacity as general Counsel of Code 04; JOSEPH VIGNALLT, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 7204; PAUL SHANG, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 707; SUN HAN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 74; ROBERT WINGO, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 7502; ROBERT KOLLAPS, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 7102; JAMES SHANNON, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Chief of NSWC; KEVIN M. MCCOY, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Chief of NAVSEA; GARY ROUGIIHEAD, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Chief of Naval Operations; BARBARA REDINGER, Individually and in her Official Capacity as Security Manager Code 40; B. CAHILL, Ms., Individually and in her Official Capacity as Head of Workforce Relations Branch Code

39,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, District Judge. (1:09-cv-03479-CCB)

Submitted: July 20, 2023 Decided July 25, 2023

2 Before NIEMEYER and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Yuri J. Stoyanov, Appellant Pro Se

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

3 PER CURIAM: Yuri I. Stoyanov seeks to appeal the district court's orders (1) granting Defendants' motion to lift a previously imposed stay in the underlying proceedings and renew their motion to dismiss or for summary judgment; and (2) denying Stoyanov's "Motion to Reconsider 12/9/22 Order Denying Plaintiff's Third Urgent Motion to Disqualify and Remove Career Criminal Kelly Marzullo From Defendants' Representative Position for Harm, Fraud, Perjury and Federal Crimes of Mail Fraud." This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292; Fed. R. Civ. P.54(B);-Cohen v.-Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp. 337 U.S. 541, 545-6, (1949). The orders Stoyanov seeks to appeal are neither final orders nor appealable interlocutory or collateral orders. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED

P.S. For the rebuttal of the above NIEMEYER, THACKER and Keenan's fraudulent decision of 7/25/23 see the September 7, 2023 Petition for rehearing en banc. Petitioner disclosed their fraud and intentional misrepresentations of facts: Specifically, to dismiss the Appeal by fraud the panel of the 4-th Circuit Court of Appeals in the 7/25/23 unpublished opinion deliberately misrepresented facts and intentionally omitted the Issue #1 (in the 3/30/23 appeal and in the Informal Brief), i.e. district judge Blake's final 3/17/23 order denying by fraud Petitioner's 3/10/23 "**Motion for Federal Criminal Investigation into Fraud on the Court and the willful and persistent cover-up of crimes and criminals of organized crimes of 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023.**" Specifically, in the Appeal and in the Informal Brief Petitioner listed two issues: Issue#1: the 3/17/23 district court final order denying Plaintiff's unopposed 3/10/23 "**Motion for Federal Criminal Investigation into Fraud on the Court and the willful and persistent cover-up of crimes and criminals of organized crimes of 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023,**" and the Issue #2: the 2/9/23 district court final order denying Plaintiff's unopposed 12/21/22 "Motion to Reconsider the 12/9/22 order denying the unopposed 11/18/22 Plaintiff's Third Urgent Motion to Disqualify and Remove Career Criminal Kelly Marzullo from Defendants' Representative Position for Harm, Fraud, Perjury and Federal Crimes of MAIL fraud." To deny the Appeal by fraud the Issue #1 was intentionally not listed in the panel's PER CURIAM nor considered. The Issue #1 is a crucial issue for this Court to consider and to stop district judge Blake's willful and persistent escalation of Fraud upon the Court, the intentional

planning and careful execution with defendants' representative Marzullo and the agency representative defendant Kessmeier criminal schemes to dismiss the case by fraud, by committing the whole series of federal crimes of Mail Fraud and the cover-up of crimes and criminals for the purpose to dismiss the consolidated by fraud case without discovery, without court hearing, without jury trial, without the investigation of federal crimes of Mail Fraud and Blake's fraud upon the court. The **3/10/23 "Motion for Federal Criminal Investigation into Fraud on the Court and the willful and persistent cover-up of crimes and criminals of organized crimes of 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023"** with supported direct evidence in the court record and the Supreme Court decision to order the federal criminal investigation warranty to remove this career criminal from Petitioner's cases, to satisfy the fundamental requirement of a fair trial before an impartial tribunal. This is a basic tenet of the American judicial system, however, because of judge Blake's willful and persistent fraud upon the court in 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023, the whole proceeding under Blake is a fraud. "Fraud upon the court" makes void the orders and judgments of that court. It is also clear and well-settled law that any attempt to commit "fraud upon the court" vitiates the entire proceeding." [6.] Plaintiff will not obtain fair hearing, fair adjudication of claims in six lawsuits, the discovery of over 243 claims, the examination under oath of 46 witnesses/defendants and 14 counts against defendants, and jury trial to supplement intentionally deficient court records. In *Bullock v. United States*, [2.] the court stated "Fraud upon the court is fraud which is directed to the judicial machinery itself and is not fraud between the parties

or fraudulent documents, false statements or perjury.

... It is where the court or a member is corrupted or influenced or influence is attempted or where the judge has not performed his judicial function ---thus where the impartial functions of the court have been directly corrupted." Id. [3.] "Fraud upon the court" makes void the orders and judgments of that court. It is also clear and well -settled law that any attempt to commit "fraud upon the court" vitiates the entire-proceeding." [6.]

Plaintiff respectfully requests to grant this "Motion for Federal Criminal Investigation into Fraud on the Court and the willful and persistent cover-up of crimes and criminals of Organized Crimes of 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023," so that current district judge C. Blake to be investigated and removed and Plaintiff could receive fair hearing, discovery, and jury trial.

---

### **APPENDIX 3**

: DISTRICT JUDGE BLAKE'S 3/17/23 ORDER

Case 1:09-cv-03479-CCB Document 115 Filed 03/17/23

Page 1 of 2

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

YURI J. STOYANOV

v. Civil No, CCB-09-3479

RAY MABUS, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, et al.

ORDER

In May 2021, the defendants in this case filed a motion to dismiss or for summary judgment (ECF 86). After pro se plaintiff Dr. Yuri Stoyanov was granted multiple extensions of time and after his interlocutory appeal to the Fourth Circuit was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction on April 28, 2022 (ECF 104-1), the defendants filed motion to lift stay and renew their

motion to dismiss or for summary judgment,(ECF 112) Dr. Stoyanov has objected, but provided no good reason why this case should not proceed.(ECF 114). Instead, he repeats allegations of criminal mail fraud and conspiracy against government counsel and courthouse personnel, including the undersigned judge. It is time for Dr. Stoyanov to directly address the government's motion. The docket having been reviewed, it is hereby Ordered that: 1. The motion to lift stay and renew motion to dismiss or for summary judgment, (ECF 112) is Granted;2. The motion is denied refiled as of the date of this Order; 3. Dr. Stoyanov may have 28 days to respond, in accordance with instructions previously provided by the court on June 1, 2021. (ECF 88); 4.Dr. Stoyanov's "Motion for federal Criminal Investigation into Fraud on the Court and the Willful and Persistent cover-up of Crimes and Criminals of Organized Crimes." (ECF 113) is Denied, because Dr. Stoyanov has provided no basis on which this court could order such an investigation; 5. A copy of this Order shall be provided to Chief Judge James K. Bredar, who is addressed in a "cover letter" attached to the plaintiff's motion (ECF 113-1); and 6. A copy of this Order shall be provided to plaintiff and counsel of record.

3/17/2023 Date. /s/ Catherine C. Blake/ United States District Judge

P.S. Contrary to the fraud in Blake's 3/17/23 Order denying by fraud Plaintiff's unopposed 3/10/23 'Motion for Federal Criminal Investigation into Fraud on the Court and the Willful and Persistent Cover-Up of Crimes and Criminals of Organized Crimes of 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023,"on May 28 and June 1, 2021 Marzullo submitted defendants' "motion for summary judgment" and on the same day, June 1,

2021, committed with Blake's direction Mail Fraud with court mail with the Notice addresses to Plaintiff. In Plaintiff's Exhibit A is direct evidence of the June 2021 Mail Fraud committed by Blake with Marzullo to dismiss by Mail Fraud plaintiff case without discovery, without court hearing, without jury trial, and without the investigation of Blake's fraud upon the court, See (ECF91) Plaintiff's 8/12/21 "Fifth urgent motion for discovery and to conduct criminal investigation into federal crimes of Mail Fraud committed as recently as June 2021 and January 2021, and in August 2020, July 2020, April 2019, March 2019 and January 2019.' Blake intentionally planned and carefully executed with Marzullo and defendant Kessmeier criminal schemes involving a series of Mail Fraud starting from the January 2019 Mail Fraud and Wire Fraud committed with Plaintiff's certified mail containing summonses and complaint for 15 defendants in Bethesda, MD and up to June 2021 Mail Fraud with court mail addressed to Plaintiff. After Blake's first criminal scheme failed to dismiss Plaintiff's case by January 2019 Mail Fraud and Wire Fraud with certified mail because Plaintiff timely discovered and filed 1/18/19 "Motion to investigate Fraud and to compel defendants' representative to accept and serve with summons and complaint on 15 defendants in Bethesda, MD," then Blake denied the 1/18/19 motion by fraud and since 2019 to this day denied by fraud all motions for discovery and motions for sanctions against defendants and intentionally planned and carefully executed with Marzullo another set of criminal scheme with another series of Mail Fraud and fraudulent "consolidation" i.e. adding by fraud five lawsuits to dismiss by fraud the "consolidated" case in the second and follow-on criminal schemes of 2019,

2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023 involving a series of Mail Fraud and Blake's cover-up of crimes and criminals. Blake's 3/17/23 order is the direct evidence of Blake's fraud upon the court and willful and persistent cover-up of crimes and criminals. Blake intentionally planned and carefully executed with Marzullo criminal schemes involving the series of Mail Fraud, including the June 2021 Mail Fraud, the January 2021 Mail Fraud, and the series of Mail Fraud of 2020 and 2019 committed to dismiss Plaintiff's case by fraud, without discovery, without court hearing, without jury trial and without the investigation of Blake's fraud upon the court, her willful and persistent cover-up of crimes and criminals. To stop Blake's fraud upon the court Plaintiff filed 2019 appeal with the 4-th Circuit and then petition for writ of certiorari with the US Supreme Court No.19-1179. In 2020 after petition was denied Blake was encouraged and escalated fraud upon the court, committed with Marzullo more criminal schemes involving a series of Mail Fraud of 2020 and 2021, including the June 2021 Mail Fraud, and Blake's cover-up of 2020 and 2021 crimes. Plaintiff filed with chief judge Bredar the 9/13/21 "motion to transfer the consolidated by fraud case from Blake to another judge." (ECF 97), After Blake denied unopposed motion of 9/13/21, Plaintiff filed appeal with the 4-th Circuit and then petition for writ of certiorari with the US Supreme Court No. 22-303. Note that after the June 2021 Mail Fraud was disclosed in the 8/12/21 motion (ECF 91) and in the 9/13/21 motion (ECF 97), and in the appeal to 4-th Circuit Blake, issued 1/18/22 order denying defendants 6/1/21'motion for summary judgment." Thus, contrary to Blake's fraud in the 3/17/23 order the June 2021 Mail Fraud committed by Blake with Marzullo was

timely discovered and disclosed in Plaintiff's Exhibits A, B and C attached to 8/12/21 motion to investigate fraud (ECF 91) and disclosed to higher courts. Blake's 1/18/22 order denying defendants' 6/1/21 "motion for summary judgment" was to cover-up Blake's fraud upon the court because Plaintiff discovered and disclosed the June 2021 Mail Fraud in motions, to the Chief Judge and in the Appeal to 4-th Circuit. Note that in 3/17/23 order Blake granted defendants' motion to lift, i.e. rescinded the 1/18/22 order by fraud because since 1/18/22 order there was no investigation of the June 2021 Mail Fraud and since 2019 to this day there was no discovery, Plaintiff's motions for discovery and to investigate fraud and Mail Fraud were unopposed and were denied by Blake by fraud since 2019 to this day. In the 3/17/23 Order Blake intentionally misrepresented facts to cover-up these crimes by fraud and even in the name of 3/10/23 motion, deliberately deleted years "2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023," instead of the correct name: Willful and Persistent Cover-Up of Crimes and Criminals of Organized Crimes "of 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023," The rebuttal of the above Blake's fraudulent order of 3/17/23 see the April 25, 2023 Petitioner's Brief to 4<sup>th</sup> Circuit and the September 7, 2023 Petition for rehearing en banc.<sup>3</sup>

---

**APPENDIX 4**

**: District judge Blake's 2/9/23 Order**  
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND  
YURI J. STOYANOV v.  
RAY MABUS, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, et al.  
Case 1:09-cv-03479-CCB Document 111 Filed 02/09/23  
Page 1 of 13

**ORDER**

District judge Blake's 2/9/23 Order was printed "Denied. February 9, 2023" on the last page of the copy of Plaintiff's 12/21/22 motion to reconsider and 12/9/22 order (ECF109) denying Plaintiff's Third Urgent motion to disqualify and remove k. Marzullo from defendants' representative position for harm, fraud, perjury and federal crimes of Mail Fraud." See Appendix 8.

P.S. This and prior Plaintiff's motions were unopposed by defendants and were denied by Blake by fraud. Since 2019 defendants' representative Marzullo with impunity carefully executed Blake's intentionally planned criminal schemes of Mail Fraud, fraud and perjury. Since 2019 Plaintiff filed motions and to this day, see 2/9/23 Blake's order, Blake denied by fraud Plaintiff's unopposed motions to disqualify and remove Marzullo from defendants' representative position for harm, fraud, perjury and federal crimes of Mail Fraud. For the rebuttal of the above Blake's fraudulent order of 2/9/23 see Plaintiff's 12/21/22 motion to reconsider 12/9/22 order (ECF109) denying Plaintiff's Third Urgent motion to disqualify and remove k. Marzullo from defendants' representative position for harm, fraud, perjury and federal crimes of Mail Fraud."

---

**APPENDIX 5**

: DISTRICT JUDGE BLAKE'S 1/18/22 ORDER  
Case 1:09-cv-03479-CCB Document 103 Filed 01/18/22  
Page 1 of 1

**ORDER**

It appears from the record that the plaintiff has taken an appeal to the Fourth Circuit, causing further delay in the resolution of the defendants' motion to dismiss (ECF 86). So that the matter will not remain open on

the court's docket pending the Circuit's court review, it is hereby Ordered that: 1. The motion (ECF 86) is Denied without prejudice to renew upon request by the defendants after the Fourth Circuit has ruled on the pending appeal; and 2. The Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to the plaintiff and counsel of record.  
1/18/22 Date /s/ Catherine C. Blake United Stats District Judge.

P.S. Note that in the 1/18/22 order Blake intentionally concealed that on May 28, 2021 and June 1, 2021 defendants filed "motion for summary judgment or dismiss" (ECF 86) and (ECF 87) and on the same day, June 1, 2021, Marzullo with Blake's direction committed Mail Fraud with court mail addressed to Plaintiff with a Notice (ECF 88). Blake's 1/18/22 order is the direct result of the June 2021 Mail Fraud with court mail (ECF 88) addressed to Plaintiff and committed at the court to harm Plaintiff. See Plaintiff's Exhibit A: Plaintiff timely discovered and disclosed the June 2021 Mail Fraud and requested to investigate this and prior series of Mail Fraud of 2019, 2020 and 2921 in the "motion for discovery and to investigate Mail Fraud" (ECF 91) and in the "motion to transfer consolidated by fraud case from Blake to another judge" filed with Chief Judge (ECF 97), and in the appeal to 4-th Circuit. Blake's 1/18/22 order is direct evidence of Blake's fraud upon the court and willful and persistent cover-up of crimes and criminals. Blake intentionally planned and carefully executed with Marzullo criminal schemes involving the series of Mail Fraud, including the June 2021 Mail Fraud with court mail containing Notice (ECF 88) to dismiss Plaintiff's case by fraud, without discovery, without court hearing, without jury trial and without the investigation of Blake's fraud upon the court, her

**Additional material  
from this filing is  
available in the  
Clerk's Office.**