

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix A: United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, Order, January 21, 2026	1a
---	----

Appendix B: United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, Petition for a Writ of Mandamus, November 14, 2025.....	3a
---	----

APPENDIX A

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

No. 25-5412

September Term, 2025

1:25-cv-03102-AHA

Filed On: January 21, 2026

In re: Bahig F. Bishay,
Petitioner

BEFORE: Millett, Pan, and Garcia, Circuit
Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of the petition for writ of mandamus, and the petitions for other relief, it is

ORDERED that the mandamus petition and the petitions for other relief be denied. Petitioner has not shown a clear and indisputable right to the relief requested. See *Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for D.C.*, 542 U.S. 367, 380-81 (2004).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:
Clifton B. Cislak, Clerk

BY: /s/
Selena R. Gancasz
Deputy Clerk

APPENDIX B

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT No. __¹

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIVIL ACTION
No: 1:25-cv-03102

In re BAHIG F. BISHAY, Petitioner,
Plaintiff & Private Attorney General at the behest of
all citizens of the United States under 18 U.S.C. §§
1961-1968 (1994 ed. and Supp. III)

v.

FRANK DENNIS SAYLOR, IV, *et al.*, solely in
individual capacities,
Defendants, Respondents²

¹ **Judicial Notice:** by three Order(s) issued by the United States Chief Justice on December 11, 2024, the Chief Justice *disqualified* the D.C. Circuit (in its entirety) and, instead, under Title 28, United States Code, section 291 (a), the Chief Justice designated and assigned three judicial officers from other federal circuit(s) to sit by designation in a related matter, D.C. Cir. No. 24-5197.

² State and/or federal employees named in the within matter, including judicial officers named solely in [i]ndividual capacity, are the "actors" *acting under color of law* within the meaning set forth in 18 U.S.C., § 242, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, as part of the *Civil Right Act of 1871*, the 5th and the 14th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution. Accordingly, all defendants named in this matter

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS *
UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1) *** DIRECTING
THE DISTRICT COURT AND ITS CLERK TO
FORTHWITH COMPLY WITH THE
FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE**

THE DISCRETE RELIEF SOUGHT

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1); the *Judiciary Act* of 1789; the *Fifth* and *Fourteenth* Amendments to the U.S. Constitution; 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1985(3); and Public Policy as pertaining to the within Plaintiff and those similarly situated citizen(s) of the United States under 18 U.S.C. §§1961-1968 (1994 ed. and Supp. III), the Plaintiff-Petitioner, acting as Private Attorney General pursuant to the authority vested in him by the U.S. Congress under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-

solely in [individual] capacities may be self-represented, or represented by their private insurers or by their private counsels, but may *not* use taxpayers' money to defend themselves by engaging attorneys employed by the U.S. Department of Justice ("DOJ"), nor cause the DOJ to employ private counsels to represent them, as set forth in 28 CFR § 50.15. This because said individuals have *not* done the business of the sovereign (the United States of America) when they took matters into their own hands and abrogated, negligently, willfully, and fraudulently U.S. [c]onstitutional mandates and specific protections available to *all* citizens of the United States under state and/or federal law, as chronicled in the *Verified Complaint* dated August 31, 2025, pursuant to the U.S. Supreme Court's holding in *Ex parte Young*. *to wit: "when an official acts pursuant to an unconstitutional statute, the absence of valid authority leaves the official ultra vires his authority. and thus a private actor stripped of his status as a representative of the sovereign."* *Ex parte Young*. 209 U.S. 123, 28 S.Ct. 441, 52 L.Ed. 714 (1908)

1968, Bahig F. Bishay (hereinafter "PAG-Bishay"), respectfully moves this Federal Circuit to direct the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, and its Clerk, Ms. Angela D. Caesar, to forthwith comply with the strict, clear and unambiguous *Federal Rules of Civil Procedure*, specifically Rules: 12(a); 55(a) and (b); and 54(b) and (c), which state as follows, respectively in the relevant parts:

(a) Time to Serve a Responsive Pleading.

Unless another time is specified by a federal statute, the time for serving a responsive pleading is as follows:

(1) *In General.*

(A) A defendant must serve an answer:

(i) within 21 days after being served with the summons and complaint. .. See Rule 12(a) of the *Federal Rules of Civil Procedure*.

RULE 55:

(a) **Entering a Default.** When a party against whom a judgment for affirmative relief is sought has failed to plead or otherwise defend, and that failure is shown by affidavit or otherwise, **the clerk must enter the party's default.** (b) **Entering a Default.**

(b) **Entering a Default Judgment.**

(1) **By the Clerk.** If the plaintiff's claim is for a sum certain or a sum that can be made certain by computation, the clerk-on the plaintiffs request, with an affidavit showing the amount due-must enter judgment for that amount and costs against a defendant who has been defaulted for not appearing and who is neither a minor nor an incompetent person.

(2) **By the Court.** In all other cases, the party must apply to the court for a default judgment. .. If the party against whom a default judgment is sought has appeared personally or by a representative, that party or its representative must be served with written notice of the application at least 7 days before the hearing. The court may conduct hearings or make referrals-preserving any federal statutory right to a jury trial when, to enter or effectuate judgment, it needs to:

(A) conduct an accounting;

(B) determine the amount of damages;

(C) establish the truth of any allegation by evidence; or

(D) investigate any other matter.

RULE 54:

(b) **Judgment on Multiple Claims or Involving Multiple Parties.** When an action presents more

than one claim for relief-whether as a claim, counterclaim, crossclaim, or third-party claim-or when multiple parties are involved, the court may direct entry of a final judgment as to one or more, but fewer than all, claims or parties only if the court expressly determines that there is no just reason for delay. Otherwise, any order or other decision, however designated, that adjudicates fewer than all the claims or the rights and liabilities of fewer than all the parties does not end the action as to any of the claims or parties and may be revised at any time before the entry of a judgment adjudicating all the claims and all the parties' rights and liabilities.

(c) **Demand for Judgment; Relief to Be Granted.** A default judgment must not differ in kind from, or exceed in amount, what is demanded in the pleadings. Every other final judgment should grant the relief to which each party is entitled, even if the party has not demanded that relief in its pleadings. [Bold and underlined text added for emphasis]

THE DISCRETE ISSUE PRESENTED

Notwithstanding the clarity of the above referenced federal authority, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and its Clerk, Ms. Angela D. Caesar, deliberately failed to comply with the strict mandates set forth in the above referenced federal authority, despite repeated written demands made by PAG-Bishay which fell on deaf ears, as the record

appended hereto so reflect in Bates Nos. 001 through 237, where Clerk Angela D. Caesar repeatedly ignored PAG-Bishay's written demand(s) for strict compliance with the federal authority cited above, and, instead in an effort to escape the ministerial duties referenced above, Clerk Caesar placed every document PAG-Bishay submitted in a proverbial *black hole*, as reflected in CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 1:25-CV-03102, at Bates Nos. 231 through 237, where the Clerk merely typed on October 15, October 22; again on October 22; October 30; November 1; and November 8, 2025, the following: ***REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE REVIEW.***

REASON WHY THE WRIT SHOULD ISSUE

Pursuant to Rule 10(c) of the *Federal Rules of Civil Procedure*, PAG-Bishay incorporates herein by reference all the pleadings submitted below, which this Court should find [clear] and [un]ambiguous, contemporaneously presented herewith.

Respectfully submitted this day, November 14,
2025, by:

Bahig F. Bishay,
/s/

Bahig F. Bishay, Plaintiff & Private Attorney
General Authorized by the U.S. Congress under 18
U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968 (1994 ed. and Supp. III)

P.O. Box 396
Norwood, MA 02062

Tel: 781.551.0400
BFBishay@earthlink.net

**PLAINTIFF-PETITIONER'S RULE 26.1
CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

Plaintiff-Petitioner is a natural person. As such, a corporate disclosure statement is not required. Fed. R. APP. P. 26. 1(a).

**CERTIFICATE OF TYPE-VOLUME LIMIT,
TYPEFACE, AND TYPE-STYLE**

I hereby certify that this document complies with Rule 32(g)(1). This document contains total of 1,400 countable words. This document complies with the typeface requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and the type-style requirements of Fed. R. App. 32(a)(6) because this document was prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word in a 14-point Times New Roman font.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Bahig Bishay, certify that I served this document on Angela D. Caesar, Clerk of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, via Electronic Mail on November 14, 2025.

/s/

RECORD APPENDIX

Bates 001-003:

*DEMAND RESPECTFULLY MADE ON CHIEF JUDGE JAMES BOASBERG TO ORDER DISTRICT CLERK ANGELA D. CAESAR *** WHO IS IN CONTEMPT OF THE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE*** TO FORTHWITH COMPLY WITH THE STRICT MANDATES SET FORTH IN RULE 12(a); RULE 55(a) and (b); and RULE 54(b) and (c), WITHOUT FURTHER DELAY*

Bates 004-006:

SECOND DEMAND MADE ON ANGELA D. CAESAR, IN THE CAPACITY OF "CLERK" OF THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, FOR THE FORTHWITH ENTRY, WITHOUT FURTHER DELAY, OF THE TWENTY TWO DEFAULT(S) AND THE DEFAULT JUDGMENT(S) PREVIOUSLY DEMANDED ON OCTOBER 20, 2025, PURSUANT TO RULES: 12(a); 55(a) and (b); and 54(b) and (c), OF THE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

Bates 007-009:

NOTICE VIA RESTRICTED MAIL DELIVERED TO CLERK ANGELA D. CAESAR

Bates 010-011:

PLAINTIFF'S RULE 54 & 55 AFFIDAVIT

Bates 012-013:

*PLAINTIFF'S RULE 54 & 55 APPLICATION FOR
THE ENTRY OF DEFAULT(S) AND DEFAULT
JUDGMENT(S)*

Bates 014-015:

JUDGMENT [proposed]

Bates 016-230:

*DEMAND FOR FORTHWITH STATUTORY
RECUSAL, AB INITIO, OF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE
AMIR HATEM ALI; and OTHER RELIEF*

Bates 231-232:

Email sent to Clerk Angela D. Caesar

Bates 233:

Email sent to Clerk Angela D. Caesar

Bates 234-237:

*U.S. District Court, District of Columbia (Washington,
DC)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 1:25-cv-03102*

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