

No. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

_____*

CHRISTOPHER D. SCHNEIDER,

PETITIONER-Plaintiff

vs.

BANK OF AMERICA N.A, FHLMC LBAC 173 a.k.a. FEDERAL HOME LOAN
MORTGAGE CORPORATION (FREDDIE MAC), BANK OF AMERICA HOME
LOANS SERVICING LP, BALBOA INSURANCE CO, BANK OF AMERICA
MORTGAGE, QUALITY LOAN SERVICE CORP., HOME RETENTION GROUP,
DOES 2-40

RESPONDENTS- Defendants

_____*

ON PETITION FOR A STAY TO THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS;
CASE NOS. 16-16261; related to 18-15106 (Dismissed).

PETITIONER'S APPENDIX V. 1 OF 1

Petitioner/Plaintiff in pro per:

Christopher D. Schneider

16291 Stone Jug Rd.

Sutter Creek CA 95685

Email: Horsefun69@yahoo.com

Phone: —none—

(Both remain unavailable miles away)

This document was: Prepared and Printed
using 100 % local portable SOLAR ENERGY

APPENDIX V. 1 OF 1

June 28, 2018 Ninth Circuit's Order denying stay/brief extension.....	1
Ninth Circuit's Order of March 1, 2018 denying appellate transfer motion.....	3
November 12, 2017 Schneider's amended notice of appeal No. 1 (never filed).....	4
Schneider's Letter of April 3, 2017 as posted in 16-16261.....	7
Schneider's list of current common issues to both Ninth Circuit Cases.....	8
January 15, 2018 Amended notice of Appeal No. 2 filed EDCA Dkt. No. ?	10

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FILED

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JUN 28 2018

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

CHRISTOPHER D. SCHNEIDER,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 16-16261

D.C. No.

2:11-cv-02953-JAM-EFB

Eastern District of California,
Sacramento

ORDER

Before: CANBY and RAWLINSON, Circuit Judges.

Appellant's motion for a refund of filing fees (Docket Entry No. 2) is denied.

Appellant's "motion for immediate public disclosure of composition of secret appellate tribunal" (Docket Entry No. 16) is denied.

Appellant's motions to file documents (Docket Entry Nos. 19, 22, 24) are granted in part. The court has considered these documents with regard to appellant's pending motions. Appellant may file documents in support of his opening brief in accordance with Ninth Circuit Rule 30-1.

Appellant's motions for a further stay of the briefing schedule and for an extension of time to file the opening brief (Docket Entry Nos. 14, 17, 20) are denied.

The opening brief is due August 28, 2018; the answering brief is due

September 27, 2018; and the optional reply brief is due within 21 days after service of the answering brief.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FILED

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MAR 1 2018

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

CHRISTOPHER D. SCHNEIDER,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 16-16261

D.C. No.

2:11-cv-02953-JAM-EFB

Eastern District of California,
Sacramento

ORDER

Before: CANBY and TROTT, Circuit Judges.

Appellant's motion for injunctive relief (Docket Entry No. 9) is denied.

Appellant's motion to transfer this appeal to the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals (Docket Entry No. 11) is denied.

The court sua sponte grants appellant an extension of time to file the opening brief. The opening brief is now due on April 9, 2018. The answering brief is due on May 9, 2018. The optional reply brief is due within 21 days after service of the answering brief.

Because appellant is proceeding without counsel, the excerpts of record requirement is waived. *See* 9th Cir. R. 30-1.2. Appellees' supplemental excerpts of record are limited to the district court docket sheet, the notice of appeal, the judgment or order appealed from, and any specific portions of the record cited in appellees' brief. *See* 9th Cir. R. 30-1.7.

**United States Court of Appeals
for the Ninth Circuit**

—*—

CHRISTOPHER D. SCHNEIDER,

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

BANK OF AMERICA N.A., QUALITY LOAN SERVICE CORP., BALBOA
INSURANCE, FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE CORP. BANK OF
AMERICA MORTGAGE, HOME RETENTION GROUP, DOES et. al.

Defendants-Appellees

Appeal from the United States District Court
For the Eastern District of California
2:11-CV-002953-JAM-EFB

APPELLANT'S AMENDED NOTICE OF APPEAL

Plaintiff-Appellant¹:

This document was: Prepared and Printed
using 100 % local portable SOLAR ENERGY

Christopher D. Schneider

16291 Stone Jug Rd.

Sutter Creek CA 95685

Email: Horsefun69@yahoo.com

Email unavailable; Phone: —none—

¹ Appellant does not waive any issues of law/fact so long as he remains under a *de facto* home detention in retaliation for his editorial speech, so long as petitioner remains without a Driver's License/Photo ID in a very rural location *Mitchell v. Budd*, 350 U.S. 473, 478 hn. 3 (1956) and *continues* to be denied *fundamental* mobility, and necessities of life, and personal access to the Ninth Circuit Court's building/legal resources "while he waits."

AMENDED NOTICE OF APPEAL

Plaintiff, Christopher D. Schneider, gives NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES that pursuant to Federal Rules of Appellate Practice Rule 3 and the Ninth Circuit Court's order of August 30, 2016 as Docket No. 3: he hereby files this amended notice of appeal—to petition the government for a redress—and to all parties that he is appealing any and all additional orders, issues, rulings, errors etc. from now (e.g. ECF No. 352, served on October 12, 2017, accepting in full the findings and recommendations of the magistrate judge on Plaintiff's post-judgment "New Trial" motion) backwards to the time of the filing of his original notice of appeal filed in person at the Eastern District Courthouse in Sacramento CA. on July 18, 2016 and then entered on July 19, 2016 as ECF No. 303 and incorporates here in full by reference that original NOTICE OF APPEAL.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States, that the forgoing is true and correct.

Executed on November 12, 2017 in SUTTER CREEK, CA.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chris Schneider", is written over a horizontal line.

CHRISTOPHER D. SCHNEIDER APPELLANT, PLAINTIFF

COURT: Ninth Circuit Court, San Francisco
CASE NO: 16-16261
CASE NAME: *Schneider v. Bank of America N.A. et al.*

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, am a citizen of the United States, resident of the State of California. My Address is:

16291 Stone Jug Rd.
Sutter Creek CA 95685

I am over the age of 18, and a party to the above-entitled action and on November 13, 2017 I served via First-Class Mail, a copy of; **Appellant's Amended Notice of Appeal.**

I, served the above mentioned on:

Leslie M. Werlin Esq.
McGuireWoods LLP
1800 Century Park East 8th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Matthew Learned Esq.
McCarthy & Holthus LLP
1770 4TH Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101

By placing the sealed envelopes with the United States Postal Service, the envelopes were addressed and mailed as follows:


Leslie M. Werlin Esq.
McGuireWoods LLP
1800 Century Park East 8th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Matthew Learned Esq.
McCarthy & Holthus LLP
1770 4TH Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on November 13, 2017 at Sutter Creek, CA

This document was: Printed and Served
using 100% Portable Local SOLAR ENERGY

By: 

Chris Schneider in pro per

Christopher D. Schneider
16291 Stone Jug Rd.
Sutter Creek CA 95685
Horsefun69@yahoo.com

Christopher D. Schneider

April 3, 2017

Ninth Circuit Court Clerk
PO BOX 193939
San Francisco, CA 94119-3939

RECEIVED
MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
APR 05 2017

Re: Courts service of all documents

FILED _____
DOCKETED _____
DATE _____ INITIAL _____

Dear Ninth Circuit Clerk,

Less than a month ago I filed an Appeal of a Tax Court decision (Schneider v. CIR; ninth circuit case number unknown), and about nine months ago an appeal in a civil case (16-16261).

I do not know if anything has been generated in either of these cases over the prior 45+ days as I have not had any access to any email (I had my Driver's License/Picture ID¹ seized). I can only view such emails at a public library located a 20 minute drive away from my home in a very rural and isolated location without public transportation, and do not know when I may again be able to access email. I therefore request that I be timely mailed any and all Court correspondence, this has already been long discussed in multiple prior court filings. But, out of an abundance of caution I am reiterating the facts.

Sincerely,


Christopher D. Schneider

¹ For over three years now my *continuing* "pains and disabilities" inflicted upon me in all 50 states *ex parte* (Verified Blacklisting via National Driver's Registry on June 27 2016, and again refused a license via California DMV on December 6, 2016) all in direct retaliation for my First Amendment editorial speech criticizing the California Department of Motor Vehicles who then "immediately" suspended my only form of Photo ID and Driver's License.

Appendix V.2

Pg. 7

EXHIBIT B

A FEW MAJOR ISSUES/FACTS COMMON TO BOTH CASES **REGARDLESS** OF EACH CASE'S SPECIFICS

1. Absolute and unequivocal refusal of **any** entry to “public courthouse” as highlighted on the following days by Schneider’s *unchallenged* declarations and **verifiable** video/audio by **the courts themselves**: August 11 and November 13, 2017 as to the Ninth Circuit Court specifically. December 1, 2017 as to the Washington D.C. Tax Court. March 7 and November 28, 2016 as to the Tax Court and Northern District Court of California in San Francisco.
2. Additional collateral complete and discriminatory refusals of all listed “public” facilities on the dates listed above in No. 1: Clerk’s Offices; Clerk’s computer terminals for public records; clerk’s office copier(s); restrooms; drinking fountains; eating establishments, vending machines, elevators, **courtrooms** (both civil and/or criminal); “PUBLIC LAW LIBRARIES”; hallways, meeting rooms, and all other open and readily accessible areas in each building including any and all that could have artistic or historic value or works of art (i.e. Ninth Circuit’s “Grand corridor” or its bronze art deco era elevators).
3. *Immediate* and often *complete* First Amendment censorship *and* prior restraint in its purest form, of personal (or association) speech of a person or litigant **wishing to file documents in person**, review their case docket **etc.** in all of the buildings. With a related arbitrary censorship of allowing **all** members of the public to gain knowledge via public law libraries, **observe public courtrooms/trials**, and to do first hand in person research, and report to the world what they see, and learn about how America’s “fair” “justice” system works in the real world vs. the dry theory promoted by others with vested interests.
4. If the deprivation of items 1-3 are either deliberate, a custom or policy known and sanctioned by management, or if they are a “structural error” that implicates the foundational integrity of the entire judicial process (e.g. with a person refused entry to his own trial, or because of his speech (dares to challenge discrimination etc.) or equally bad because he happens to look poor or down on his luck.

EXHIBIT B

5. All humans and “every citizen’s right to educate himself” in a public library in the United States on completely equal and non-arbitrary or discriminatory terms.
6. The implications of the seizure of a person’s driver’s license and only form of “photo ID” and each and every *collateral* daily and irreparable consequences to the millions of Americans who have experienced being wrongfully denied countless civil rights, opportunities, and who have been wrongfully “blacklisted” in all 50 states in the the National Driver Registry.
7. The differences in a person losing their photo ID and Driver’s License to every aspect of their daily lives and survival when they happen to live in **RURAL AMERICA VS. IN A CITY**. Particularly, when that person then needs to get food, banking services, legal supplies, do legal research to defend their rights/prosecute oppression.
8. If and when a person who dares to challenge the status-quo of all U.S. Courts by being treated as a third-class citizen¹ to the way he has *actually* been *repeatedly* treated (along with untold-unspoken **countless** others) with such comments as “Go back to where you came from” after he was refused entry to the Ninth Circuit Court for apparently no reason at all or in the alternative because of his well known prior stance on his and other disadvantaged persons (like the **HOMELESS**) civil rights in the Ninth Circuit Court specifically and others generally.
9. Whether any of the items listed above (as applicable) are a part of the “unwritten” and “unpublished” **rules** of a given court and its top officer (or in the alternative a majority of judges of those courts) who sets the protocols and entrance “requirements” for their “public” courthouse where “equality under the law” is the rule. And the significance of such unwritten and unpublished rules that have never been vested by *any* independent legislative or executive branch authority, let alone the public who is denied access due to them.


¹ First Class = Government; Second Class = Corporations, the 1% in income, or those who happen to/can afford to have an attorney; Third Class is everyone else: the 99% of all Americans and everyone else who might happen to find themselves acting pro se/in pro per.

Amended
PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF APPEAL¹

Plaintiff Christopher D. Schneider hereby gives NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES that pursuant to Federal Rules of Appellate Practice Rule 3 he appeals to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit² all earlier orders, judgments, ruling, errors etc. from before this date including from the district court's ORDER dated December 19, 2017 (ECF No. 355) and served on December 22, 2017 and fully incorporates *all* of his earlier NOTICES OF APPEALS.

Date: January 15, 2018

Respectfully submitted,



CHRISTOPHER D. SCHNEIDER, Plaintiff in pro per³

¹ Due to plaintiff's unjustified *continuing* denial of his Driver's License (*verified* as of June 7, 2016) in all 50 states (*verified* "blacklisting" in National Driver's Registry as of June 27, 2016) for two and a half years, in retaliation for his published editorial speech, plaintiff also objects to the *fundamental* denial of his "access to the courts" and to necessary legal resources needed for *this* appeal, and for *all* issues in *this* case. *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. 817 (1977); *Sunal v. Large*, 332 U.S. 174, 192-193 ("[A] trial that forecloses the basic right to defend... becomes almost meaningless if the larger right to defend is itself cut off."); *Bradshaw v. Zoological Society of San Diego*, 662 F.2d 1301, 1310-1311 (9th Cir. 1981) ("Tenacity, however admirable, is no substitution for a knowledge of the law.").

² Plaintiff in so filing this does not waive any issues as to jurisdiction, and any pending motions.

³ Plaintiff does not waive any issues of fact or law as they are applied to all facts since March 30, 2014; *Hann v. Plumer*, 380 US 460, 14 L.Ed.2d 8, 85 S.Ct. 1136 (1965); *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 30 L.ed. 220 (1886).