

IN THE SUPREME COURT
OF THE UNITED STATES

MICHAEL L. SCHUTTPEIZ
PETITIONER,

NO. _____

VS.

APPEAL NO. 25-1340

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
RESPONDENT,


ON A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

APPLICATION TO JUSTICE KAVANAUGH
TO EXTEND TIME
TO FILE PETITION FOR CERTIORARI
(SUP. CT. R. 13.5)

Michael Schuttpeiz, requests of the Honorable Justice Kavanaugh,
as Justice for the 6TH Circuit, to extend the time for
the filing of a Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United
States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit in the
matter of

MICHAEL L. SCHUTTPEIZ V. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
APPEAL NO. 25-1340

for a period of 60-Days, or from up to and including
January 7, 2027.



JURISDICTION

The Supreme Court and/or the Circuit Justice will have jurisdiction over this matter because 28 U.S.C. § 1254 gives the Court jurisdiction over an appeal of a Final Judgment of a United States Court of Appeals; and Supreme Court Rules #13, 22, and 30 extend jurisdiction to individual Circuit Justices, Extension of Time Authority.

REASONS WHY RELIEF FROM TIME LIMIT NEEDED

Under Supreme Court Rule 13.1, time for filing of a Petition for Writ of Certiorari in this matter expires on or about November 5, 2026.

Petitioner Michael Schuttpetz, as a Layperson has:

- 1) Requested Valuable information from the Court Clerk of the 6th Circuit District Court, which is pertinent to Michael Schuttpetz's Petition for a Writ of Certiorari; and Petitioner has not yet, been supplied with this Valuable / Pertinent information.
- 2) Put-out several feeler inquiries to various Exoneration Type organizations, and attorneys; in an attempt to both acquire assistance for preparing a Proper Petition, and obtaining the Valuable information of need; from the 6th Circuit District Court's Clerk's office.

JUDGMENTS AND POST-CONVICTION PROCEEDINGS

1) On or about FEBRUARY 16, 2010, Petitioner / applicant was convicted on 4-Counts of a 6-Count superseded indictment in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan. 2:07-CR-20410-PDB; 2:07-CR-20410-SJM-KGA

2) On or about JUNE 23, 2010, Petitioner / applicant duly appealed these convictions to the United States Court of Appeals for the 6th Circuit. The appellate Court affirmed the convictions by its order entered on or about JANUARY 9, 2012. A true and correct copy of the opinion and order of the Court is reported at United States v. Schuttpetz, 467 F. app'x 369 (6th Cir. 2012).

3) On or about MAY 15, 2014, Petitioner / applicant submitted with the District Court a Timely and Proper 28 U.S.C. § 2255 Habeas Corpus Petition / Motion, which the Court Clerk Filed at Docket Entry #150 while opening Civil Case 2:14-CV-11947-PDB.

along with an

Ex Parte Combined Motion for leave and enlargement of Time to File -- Supplemental Memorandum of Law (Briefing) in support of Petitioner / applicant's Habeas Corpus Petition / Motion, which the Court Clerk Filed at Docket Entry #148.

4) Before the Court conducted the Required Rule 4 "Initial Review," or Ordered the Government to Respond to Petitioner / applicant's Habeas Corpus Petition / Motion. The Government submitted and the Court Entertained a "Motion to Strike" the Habeas Corpus Petition / Motion for Oversized Briefing (Where NO BRIEF was submitted) on or about JUNE 5, 2014. Docket Entry #158

5) On or about JUNE 30, 2014, Petitioner/Applicant Filed with the District Court a "Motion in Opposition" to the "Motion to Strike", Stating -- Petitioner/Applicant WAS NOT in Non-Compliance with the Court's Local Rule Concerning Page - Limitations of Briefs, as there was NO BRIEFING to be out-of-Compliance with.

6) After multiple, various Pleadings of Litigation at both the District Court and Appellate Court Levels, which continued to further Delay/Suspend potential Habeas Corpus Relief to Michael Schuttpetz. On or about MAY 29, 2026, the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals -- Dismissed the 25-1340 appeal for "Lack of Jurisdiction". Subsequently thereafter, Denying En Banc Rehearing on or about August 7, 2026.

GROUND FOR RELIEF

1) This case concerns whether a Prisoner can be deprived of Judicial Review of a § 2255 Petition/Motion through a Procedural Mechanism that bypasses the Preliminary Screening Procedure specifically established for § 2255 Proceedings.

2) My Case is an extremely complex one. Full of Due Process and Judicial Misconduct issues. So, I Michael Schuttpetz, being a Pro-Se Layperson sans Legal training, am making attempts to obtain some form of assistance from someone more knowledgeable on the Un-Constitutional Legal intricacies inherent to this case.

3) I made multiple attempts at obtaining pertinent information from the 6th Circuit District Court through both failed telephonic and snail mail attempts, which as a Layperson in Prison have failed fruition; creating another reason for my seeking-out of more aptable Legal assistance.

4) The arrest, conviction, and Post-Conviction Proceedings of Michael Schuttpelz raises grave Constitutional questions concerning the Due Process Rights of the Fifth-Amendment and even several other Amendments of the Constitution of The United States since Michael Schuttpelz's § 2255 Habeas Corpus Petition/Motion has been severely Delayed/Suspended which reach far into our Changing times.

If a member of our Society can be Denied a Final appeal of Right because of Judicial fallacies, none of the questions, which torture our Countries spirit, will be allowed to be answered with nothing accomplished save the Creation of an Ideological Incarceration of an American Citizen.

5) Neither the Court nor any parties will be prejudiced or un-duly inconvenienced by the Short-Extension of time requested, since Michael Schuttpelz has already, Due to Judicial Suspension/Delays, already spent upwards of 19-years imprisoned.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, Michael Schuttpelz requests that the time for filing a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari be extended in this matter to January 7, 2027.

Respectfully Submitted,

"Without Prejudice Dec 1-2027"
Michael L.R. Schuttpelz

Dated:
October 11, 2026

MICHAEL L. SCHUTTPELZ (PRO-SE)

41686-039

PCI - LORETTO

P.O. BOX 1000

CRESSON, PENNSYLVANIA

16630

IN THE SUPREME COURT
OF THE UNITED STATES

IN THE MATTER OF MICHAEL L. SCHUTTPEIZ V. UNITED STATES
APPEAL NO. 25-1340


AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF THE
APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Under penalty of perjury Michael Schuttpreiz duly deposes and says:

My case, which I seek Certiorari upon, isn't a dispute over whether local rules may exist. My case's issue is whether a local rule may be used to terminate or suspend a § 2255 proceeding before the Rule 4 Screening required by the § 2255 Rules, particularly where the Prisoner DID NOT submit the allegedly Non-Compliant Brief, and whether a C.O.A. can be Denied to a Prisoner where his § 2255 Habeas Petition/Motion WAS NOT Denied on its merits or lack of, but rather by a Procedural Mechanism.

Furthermore, my Delayed/Suspended case involves a very serious Conflict of Interest issue as since [MAY 16, 2024] District Court Judge-Stephen J. Murphy, whom it appears was The United States Attorney back in "2007" that Ordered and/or Supervised the Prosecution and Indicting of me on the charges my § 2255 Habeas Petition/Motion is requesting Relief upon, has been making Post-Conviction Rulings upon my case to include Denial of C.O.A. and such.

Ever since first setting my eyes on the Warrant to search my Laptop Computer, when my Third Attorney of Record finally presented it to me, I thought the Warrant lacked impartiality. The Search Warrant, was only "Rubber Stamped" and not actually signed with an



Actual "Signature" and also only appeared to be a "General Warrant" of Non-Particularity. On-Its-Face for What or Where to Search-For, the Warrant only stated "See ATTACHMENT A". So, I believed the Warrant was to Seize the Lap Top Computer, which had already been Seized in a Warrantless Search of my truck 6-Days prior. The "Return" section of the Warrant issued Only lists the Lap Top Computer as the "Person or Property Taken Pursuant To The Warrant".

This caused me to immediately bring these issues to the attention of my attorneys' requesting to see [ATTACHMENT A]. My attorneys' basically ignored my requests and I was eventually convicted without the opportunity of Challenging the Lack of Impartiality and Non-Particularity of the Search Warrant of issue.

After conviction, I requested of my appellate Attorney, Mr. Dunn, to Bring Forth these issues on my Direct Appeal, amongst other issues, which I requested him to address on my behalf, where I was merely told by Attorney Dunn that, "HE IS THE ATTORNEY AND HE DOES THINGS HIS WAY", thus my Issues of Request were not brought forth upon my Direct Appeal, which is why my Personally Prepared § 2255 Habeas Corpus Petition / Motion clearly possesses [Ground #14 - INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF APPELLATE COUNSEL].

After my appeal was had I continued to try and obtain a copy of [ATTACHMENT A] so that when I or an appointed attorney DID BRIEF my § 2255 pleading, the Non-Particularity of the Warrant could also be addressed in the BRIEFING of Ground #2 and possibly Grounds #10, 11, and 13 of my § 2255 pleading Briefing.

My requests of [ATTACHMENT A] to Court Clerks' were always futile attempts. However, on [February 27, 2018] a Court Clerk filed one of my "Status Request" letters to my Docket File [at Doc. #191]. Whereas, thereafter I began to Request my letters be filed to the Docket for "Preservation of the Record". Such letters still never produced any

kind of return correspondence from the Court, but I was Preserving the Record [Doc. #'s 191-197]. Only just recently my sister Marlene Smith was able to discover that NO [ATTACHMENT A] Document even exists.

I am attempting to obtain some form of more knowledgeable Legal assistance for 2-Main Reasons. First would be the complexity of the issues of my case. Secondly, the Potential of someone more Legally adept on the outside of Prison being able to obtain the information of need from the District Court for use within my Certiorari Petition.

Mainly, why 3-Judges would Recuse Themselves from my Case but yet Judge Stephen J. Murphy, whom was the Indicting United States Attorney, would not?

I have attempted and/or am attempting to contact telephonically, and through mail correspondences of inquiry such organizations and/or Attorneys, as Brandon Samples, Tracy Hightower, Shon Hopwood, Brian Brown, Cooley Innocence Project, Freedom Ain't Free, Notre Dame Exoneration Justice Clinic, and more, which I am hoping to hear back from in the near future.

as a brief run-down of my case history, along with the Governmental and Judicial Misconduct beset upon myself and my case, which is Un-ethically and Un-equivocally Delaying/Suspending my Right to potential Habeas Corpus Relief, to restore my Liberty back to me, I say:

On [JUNE 1, 2007] I drove my Semi-truck onto the private property of a K-Mart parking lot where I was accosted by multiple gun brandishing FBI agents -- after immediately being Hand-Cuffed I asked, "WHAT IS THIS ALL ABOUT" -- Instead of being shown an arrest-Warrant or being told I was Under Arrest (as the Rules of Criminal Procedure Requires), I was only told by them

" WE ARE NOT AT LIBERTY TO TELL YOU RIGHT NOW! "

Whereas, after about a 3-hour (SLEEP DEPRIVED INTERROGATION -- where I told them my true intent right away) I was finally told I was Under Arrest (Still Without Being Shown any Warrant) and taken to Wayne County Jail. [See - Grounds #6, 7, 10, and 13 of my § 2255 Petition / Motion]

On [SEPTEMBER 18, 2007] an Un-Timely Indictment was obtained through the use of Perjured Testimony by the Government's Only-Key-Witness, depriving the Grand Jury of The Decision Making Fact to ENTRAPMENT.

On [MARCH 25, 2009] a Superseding Indictment was obtained where once again the Government's Only-Key-Witness presented the same Perjured Testimony as before. The Grand Jury Transcripts clearly show that the Prosecutor was Fully Aware of and Knowledgable of the Perjury his Only-Key-Witness was putting forth. [See - Grounds #1, 3, 10, 13, and 14 of my § 2255 Petition / Motion]

My Second Attorney of Record, Robert M. Kalec, Abandoned me when he said, " I AM NO LONGER YOUR ATTORNEY, " leaving me without any Attorney of Representation for 3-6 Months, in Violation of my " Speedy Trial Right " even though I also informed Judge Borman of the Situation with Judge Borman also on the Record, acknowledging the Fact that " YES HE HAD RECEIVED MY LETTER? " [See - Grounds #8 and #9 of my § 2255 Petition / Motion]

My Fourth Attorney (Trial Counsel) Submitted to the Court 2-Motions to " Dismiss The Indictment " before Trial. Judge Borman " Failed " to Rule upon these 2-Motions before taking me to Trial and Convicting me. [See - Grounds #1, #3, and #12 of my § 2255 Petition / Motion]

all of the afore issues of History and more are addressed in the 15- Grounds of My § 2255 Habeas Corpus Petition/Motion as Facts Presented where I never once cited a Case Law and tried as best as I could to not even argue Law within my Context. My Habeas Corpus Petition/Motion has been Un-Constitutionally Denied Due Process for over TWELVE-PLUS-YEARS by Judicial Misconduct of INORDINATE Delay/Suspension.

My Habeas Corpus Petition/Motion is Timely and Properly submitted Under the § 2255 Rules and was Filed to the Docket by a Court Clerk as such on [MAY 15, 2014 -- at Doc. Entry #150].

On or about [JUNE 5, 2014], before the Court conducted the Required Rule 4 "Initial Review" Under the Rules Governing § 2255 Proceedings and Ordered the Government to Respond to the Petition/Motion, The Government took it upon its self to submit a Pre-Mature and Violative "Motion to Strike" directed at my Properly-Filed Petition/Motion. A "Motion to Strike" which the Court entertained Without/Before the Required Rule 4 "Initial Review" was conducted. [Doc. #158]

On [JUNE 30, 2014], My Motion in Opposition to Strike was filed to the docket at [Doc. #159]. My Motion in Opposition specifically stated I was not out of Compliance with the Courts Local Rule, because NO Brief or Response was filed with my Court Specific Form to be out of Compliance with. [See-also Doc. #148]

On [JUNE 29, 2016], Magistrate Judge Whalen issued a Report and Recommendation to "Strike" my § 2255 Petition/Motion in its entirety. [Doc. #161] Which Judge Borman adhered himself to (Still With out Conducting the Required Rule 4 "Initial Review") and on [JULY 29, 2016]

Struck My Properly Filed § 2255 Habeas Corpus Petition / Motion in its entirety, only to resinal his Striking - Order on [NOVEMBER 9, 2016]. [See-Doc. Entries #163 and #176]

On [December 28, 2016], the Court Clerk filed My Objections to the (R and R) at Doc. Entry #182] which I submitted to Magistrate Judge R. Steven Whalen.

I sent out many "Status Request" letters to the Court while never receiving any replies back from My letters of Request(s). On [FEBRUARY 27, 2018] a Court Clerk filed one of My "Status Request" letters to the Docket. [Doc. #191] Thereafter, I requested of the Court Clerks, to file My letters of Request(s) to the Docket for Preservation of the Record. [See-Doc. Entries #191-#197]

Magistrate Judge R. Steven Whalen, for EIGHT-YEARS, never addressed my filed "Objections" to his "Report and Recommendation". While, The Court NEVER, through all of that "Suspension / Delay" time, CONDUCTED The Required Rule 4 "Initial Review" upon My Properly Filed by the Court Clerk, § 2255 Habeas Petition / Motion for Meritoriousness of the issues Presented.

On [December 8, 2023], Magistrate Judge Kimberly B. Altman was assigned to My Case, Replacing Judge Whalen Pursuant to Local Criminal Rule 57.10. [Doc. #?]

A little over one-month after Magistrate Judge Altman was assigned to My Case, (Still Without Conducting The Required Rule 4 "Initial Review"), and without any Filed Recommendation / R and R type Document from Magistrate Judge Altman; Judge Borman on his own accord, once again "Struck" My § 2255 Habeas Petition / Motion in its entirety on [January 24, 2024]. [Doc. # 202]

On [FEBRUARY 28, 2024], my Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(c) Motion to set aside judgment was Filed to the Docket at [Doc. #224]. On [FEBRUARY 29, 2024], Judge Borman Ordered the Government to Respond to my 59(c) Motion "BY [MARCH 20, 2024]. With NO RESPONSE from the Government (and 6-DAYS AFTER THE ORDERED DUE DATE EXPIRED), and (Without ANY MOTION for an Extension of Time from the Government). Judge Borman, in Violation of the Rules GAVE the Government a Violative extension of time to Respond to my 59(c) Motion. [See- Doc. #226 and #? (on 3/26/2024)]

There are still yet more instances of District Court judicial Misconduct associated with my Case, which did no more than Further Delay/Suspend my Constitutional Right to Habeas Corpus Review of my Case, thru-out the Record.

Especially the Fact of judicial "Conflict of Interest" instilled by Judge Stephen J. Murphy's Rulings against me, since he was the United States Attorney, whom indicted me on my Ground's Charges in "2007".

My name is Michael LeRoy Schuttpeiz. I am over 18 years of age. I currently reside in the BOP's Prison FCI-Loretto in the State of Pennsylvania. I am fully competent to make this Affidavit and I have personal knowledge of the Facts which are stated within this Affidavit.

To my knowledge, all of the Facts Presented and Stated in this affidavit are true and correct.

I sign this Affidavit on OCTOBER 14, 2026 at FCI-Loretto in the State of Pennsylvania.

"Without Prejudice 2001-2007"
X: Michael L. R. Schuttpeiz
Michael L. Schuttpeiz (Pro-Se)
4686-039
FCI-Loretto, P.O. Box 1000
Cresson, Pennsylvania
16630

No. 25-1340

- 2 -

a COA. *Schuttpelz v. United States*, Nos. 24-1122/1123, 2024 U.S. App. LEXIS 17828 (6th Cir. July 19, 2024).

Since the district court struck his § 2255 motion to vacate, Schuttpelz has filed numerous motions for relief, including several that sought to amend or vacate the strike order. The district court denied them all. At least one appeal from those denials remains pending.

Meanwhile, in October 2024, Schuttpelz filed his Motion for No COA, urging the district court to inform this court that no COA was required to appeal the denials of various motions he had filed after the district court struck his § 2255 motion. In denying the motion, the district court reasoned that it has no authority to order this court to take a particular action and that Schuttpelz was not entitled to a COA in any event. The district court also “warn[ed] Schuttpelz not to file repetitive and duplicative motions” and advised him that, “[m]oving forward, the Court will strike duplicative, repetitive, or abusive filings.”

Schuttpelz now appeals, arguing primarily that he does not need a COA to appeal the denials of the post-strike-order motions or strike order itself because the strike order did not resolve his § 2255 motion “on the merits.” He also asserts that requiring or denying a COA deprives him of his First, Fifth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendment rights and that the district judge who denied his Motion for No COA had a conflict of interest.

We lack jurisdiction over this appeal. Courts of appeals 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, 545-46 (1949). The order Schuttpelz seeks to appeal is not a final, appealable order. Neither that order nor any other order in the case terminated all of the issues presented in the § 2255 proceedings. *See Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. v. Risjord*, 449 U.S. 368, 373-75 (1981); *Catlin v. United States*, 324 U.S. 229, 233 (1945); *Bonner v. Perry*, 564 F.3d 424, 426-28 (6th Cir. 2009). Indeed, the district court’s order itself indicates that it never ruled on the merits of Schuttpelz’s claims under § 2255.

Nor is the order an appealable interlocutory one. Schuttpelz remains free to file another § 2255 motion that complies with the district court’s page limitations, and if the district court

No. 25-1340

- 3 -

denies that motion on the merits, then Schuttpelz may seek a COA from that determination. In other words, the issues raised in Schuttpelz's Motion for No COA are not "effectively unreviewable" on direct appeal. *Will v. Hallock*, 546 U.S. 345, 349 (2006) (quoting *Puerto Rico Aqueduct & Sewer Auth. v. Metcalf & Eddy, Inc.*, 506 U.S. 139, 144 (1993)).

Accordingly, we **DENY** as moot Schuttpelz's motions to supplement the record and for the appointment of counsel and **DISMISS** the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

ENTERED BY ORDER OF THE COURT



Kelly L. Stephens, Clerk

No. 25-1340

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

FILED
Aug 7, 2026
KELLY L. STEPHENS, Clerk

MICHAEL L. SCHUTTPELZ,

Petitioner-Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent-Appellee.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)


O R D E R

BEFORE: GRIFFIN, KETHLEDGE, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

The court received a petition for rehearing en banc. The original panel has reviewed the petition for rehearing and concludes that the issues raised in the petition were fully considered upon the original submission and decision of the case. The petition then was circulated to the full court. No judge has requested a vote on the suggestion for rehearing en banc.

Therefore, the petition is denied.

ENTERED BY ORDER OF THE COURT


Kelly L. Stephens, Clerk

From: Marlene Smith ferguson33.ms@gmail.com
Subject: Case # 07-20410 Michael Schuttpelz
Date: Sep 15, 2026 at 4:29:34 PM
To: Marlene Smith ferguson33.ms@gmail.com

September 15th 2026

To whom it may concern:

I Marlene Smith am writing this to let you know that I have spoke with the district court regarding case # 07-20410(for Michael Schuttpelz). Michael has asked me to reach out to them regarding an attachment A for docket#2 for 207-MC-50503-GER(which he has repeatedly asked for but had never received.

I have reached out to them 2 times (1st time on September 10th) for this said attachment A , and both responses from two different people have been that there is no attachment A.

I then proceeded to tell them that Michael Schuttpelz has a copy of the warrant and it states to see Attachment A.

But they again said there is no Attachment A.

I asked them the 2nd time I called if they had a copy of the warrant and if it did say on the warrant to see attachment A? Their response was "yes it does say see attachment A" but then proceeded to tell me that there is no Attachment A , and they have already sent him what he had asked for and needed.

"We can't send him something we just don't have". I then asked them so why does it say "see attachment A if there is no attachment A?

She asked me to hold on so she could talk to someone else about this and then when she came back on the phone she said that there is no attachment A and that the 2nd page must be attachment A.

So I asked her again and said : "so you are telling me that the warrant says see attachment A but you are saying you don't have or see an Attachment A and the 2nd page must be attachment A? is that correct?"

And she said "yes,there is no Attachment A"

I proceeded to ask her name so that if Michael wanted to reach out to them again he could ask for her.

She said her name is Miss Brown, and that there was no need for him to reach

out to her because they have already sent him what he needs, and we cannot send him something that we do not have.

Then proceeded to say regarding ECF#1 and ECF#2 we have sent everything he has asked for.

I said ok, thank you and left it at that and ended the call.

Marlene Smith
4342 Fillmore St
Sioux City Iowa 51108

This verifies what I always suspected and tried for many years [by submitting requests for within multiple "Status Letters" -- which were ignored]

to prove. The supposed "Search Warrant" to search my Lap Top Computer, was only a "General Warrant" (of non-Particularities) to seize my Lap Top Computer; which was already seized during the "Warrantless" search of my Semi-Truck 6-Days Prior.

Furthermore this original filed copy only possesses a "Rubber Stamping" instead of an actual SIGNATURE of an impartial Judge along with a "Rubber Stamped" date -- with no time of issuance.

Michael L. Schuttepich

8/21/2026

United States District Court
For The Eastern District of Michigan
Office of the Clerk
Theodore Levin United States Courthouse
231 West Lafayette Blvd. - Room 564
Detroit, Michigan 48226

Michael Schuttpelz
#41686-039
FCI (LORITTO)
P.O. Box 1000
CRESSON, PENNSYLVANIA
16630

To the Court Clerk, or Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to this office at this time in order to request valuable information which I require for the purpose of instituting litigation procedures within the Supreme Court of the United States of America.

My Case number is -- 2:07-CR-20410-SJM-KGA
United States v. Michael I. Schuttpelz

So, Sir/Ms., the information which I require and request from your office at this time is a copy of the reports the 3-judges of Recusal submitted. These reports state the Ground of Disqualification each Judge Utilized for Recusal from my Case.

The 3-judges of Recusal are:

Judge Paul D. Borman -- Whose Recusal is filed at
Docket Entry # 237,

Judge Nancy J. Edmunds -- Whose Recusal is filed at
Docket Entry # 238, and

Judge Terence H. Berg -- Whose Recusal is filed at
Docket Entry # 239

28 U.S.C. § 455 Requires that a Judge Provide full disclosure on the record of the basis of the Grounds for his or her Disqualification or Recusal. So, therefore, attached to the previously stated Docket Entries should be the individual Statements of Recusal. I Require for my Supreme Court Litigation.

So, Sir/Ms. at this time, I request that you please send to me at my Prison of Incarceration Copies of the Judges' Ground Statements for Disqualification/Recusal.

I further request from your office at this time an up-to-date copy of the Docket entries associated with my Case. This would include; the [207-ME-50503-GER] Docket, a copy of its [Doc. #2 ATTACHMENT A] Document, and a copy of my Civil Case Docket attached to my Filed § 2255 Proceeding.

Thank-You for your attention to these Concerns,
Respectfully Submitted

"Without Prejudice MCC 1-207"
Michael L.R. Schüttgen

Dated: August 21, 2026

United States District Court

EASTERN

DISTRICT OF

MICHIGAN

JUN 20 2007

CLERK'S OFFICE
DETROIT

In the Matter of the Search of
(Name, address or brief description of person or property to be searched)
Gateway Laptop Computer S/N 0030162290

SEARCH WARRANT

CASE NUMBER:

GERALD E. ROSEN
07X50503

TO: Any Special Agent of the FBI and any Authorized Officer of the United States

Affidavit(s) having been made before me by Jennie McGlynn who is a Special Agent to
believe that ☐ on the person of or ☒ on the premises known as (name, description and location)
Gateway Laptop Computer S/N 0030162290

TRUE COPY
JRT
CLERK
EASTERN
BY: *[Signature]*
DEPUTY CLERK

in the EASTERN District of MICHIGAN there is now
concealed a certain person or property, namely (describe the person or property)

SEE ATTACHMENT A

I am satisfied that the affidavit(s) and any recorded testimony establish probable cause to believe that the person or property so described is now concealed on the person or premises above-described and establish grounds for the issuance of this warrant.

YOU ARE HEREBY COMMANDED to search on or before June 6, 2007
Date

(not to exceed 10 days) the person or place named above for the person or property specified, serving this warrant and making the search (in the daytime -- 6:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M.) and if the person or property be found there to seize same, leaving a copy of this warrant and receipt for the person or property taken, and prepare a written inventory of the person or property seized and promptly return this warrant to U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE
as required by law. U.S. Judge or Magistrate Judge

JUN 6 2007

Date and Time Issued

at Detroit, Michigan

City and State

BERNARD A. FRIEDMAN

U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE MONA K. MAJZOUB

Name and Title of Judicial Officer

at

Signature of Judicial Officer

RETURN

DATE WARRANT RECEIVED

6/6/07

DATE AND TIME WARRANT EXECUTED

6/6/07

COPY OF WARRANT AND RECEIPT FOR ITEMS LEFT WITH

N/A Search Warrant obtained for

INVENTORY MADE IN THE PRESENCE OF

SA Jennie McGlynn Emmons

item taken during inventory at time of arrest of Michael Leroy Schuttgeitz

INVENTORY OF PERSON OR PROPERTY TAKEN PURSUANT TO THE WARRANT

Gateway Laptop Computer S/N 0030162290

CERTIFICATION

I swear that this inventory is a true and detailed account of the person or property taken by me on the warrant.

Jennie McGlynn Emmons, FBI Detroit

Subscribed, sworn to, and returned before me this date.

U.S. Judge or Magistrate Judge

6/20/07 Date

Told Judge we have Feb 1st
GIVEN TO ME JAN 26th TUES

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
EVIDENCE CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY

Evidence Type: ☐ General ☐ Drug ☐ Valuable ☐ Firearms ☒ CART

Special Handling Instructions	Initial Receipt	Date and Time
☐ Batteries ☐ Biohazard ☐ FGI ☐ HAZMAT ☐ Latents ☐ Refrigerate ☐ Req. Charging ☐ None ☐ Other _____	Signature: <u>Steve D. Benner</u> Printed Name: <u>Steve D. Benner</u> Reason: <u>Collected</u>	<u>6/1/07</u> <u>7:10 AM</u>

Relinquished Custody	Date and Time	Accepted Custody	Date and Time
Signature: <u>Steve D. Benner</u> Printed Name: <u>Steve D. Benner</u> Reason: <u>Transport to FBI Office</u>	<u>6/1/07</u> <u>8:00 AM</u>	Signature: <u>Jennie McGlynn Emmons</u> Printed Name: <u>Jennie McGlynn Emmons</u> Reason: <u>Transport to Evidence</u>	<u>6/1/07</u> <u>8:00 PM</u>

Relinquished Custody	Date and Time	Accepted Custody	Date and Time
Signature: <u>Jennie McGlynn Emmons</u> Printed Name: <u>Jennie McGlynn Emmons</u> Reason: <u>Evidence Control</u>	<u>6/6/07</u> <u>4:45 PM</u>	Signature: <u>Shannon Eldridge</u> Printed Name: <u>Shannon Eldridge</u> Reason: <u>Storage</u>	<u>6/6/07</u> <u>4:45 PM</u>

Relinquished Custody	Date and Time	Accepted Custody	Date and Time
Signature: <u>Shannon Eldridge</u> Printed Name: <u>Shannon Eldridge</u> Reason: <u>Not Case (1/26/07)</u>	<u>12:38 PM</u> <u>6/8/07</u>	Signature: <u>Jennie McGlynn Emmons</u> Printed Name: <u>Jennie McGlynn Emmons</u> Reason: <u>Review?</u>	<u>12:38 PM</u> <u>6/8/07</u>

Relinquished Custody	Date and Time	Accepted Custody	Date and Time
Signature: <u>Jennie McGlynn Emmons</u> Printed Name: <u>Jennie McGlynn Emmons</u> Reason: <u>Evidence Control</u>	<u>6/8/07</u> <u>2:16 PM</u>	Signature: <u>Shannon Eldridge</u> Printed Name: <u>Shannon Eldridge</u> Reason: <u>Storage</u>	<u>6/8/07</u> <u>2:16 PM</u>

Relinquished Custody	Date and Time	Accepted Custody	Date and Time
Signature: <u>Shannon Eldridge</u> Printed Name: <u>Shannon Eldridge</u> Reason: <u>Storage</u>	<u>7/5/07</u> <u>11:53 AM</u>	Signature: <u>Wanda G. Hall</u> Printed Name: <u>Wanda G. Hall</u> Reason: <u>Missing?</u>	<u>7/5/07</u> <u>11:53 AM</u>

Firearms Certification:

Printed Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Case ID: 305B-DE-101095IB: 1Barcode: E4226078

CASE AGENT

 ON WITH PUTTER
 1st. 36 round. ?

 WHAT IS THIS WORK
 AND WHATS THE PROBLEM ?

28 U.S.C. § 2255 PETITION TABLE GROUNDS

1/2

1] Open Motions On The Docket Or Record

1/2

2] Search Warrant Fails To Show Either Detachment Or Impartialness By Only Displaying A Rubber Stamping In Lieu Of An Actual And Legal Signature

9/12

3] Perjury And Prosecutorial Knowledge Of Perjury To The Grand Jury, And Failure To Realize Or Prevent Perjury At Trial

6

4] Search Of Defendant's Truck Was Not Contemporaneous With The Arrest, According To Belton

9

5] Search Of Truck Lacked Any Basis Of Probable Cause, Where Search Was Only A Speculative Fishing Expedition For The Laptop, Seized Without Warrant

1/13

6] The Charge, U.S.C. 18 § 2422(b) Coercion And Enticement, Governing The Arrest, Lacks Both The Nexus Of A Child, And Elemental Need For Travel. Constituting Un-lawful Arrest Of The Defendant

4/12

7] Defendant's Miranda Signature Of Waiver, And Statements After Were Involuntary As They Were Extracted From Defendant In A Sleep Deprived State

1/7/14

8] Defendant's Right To A Speedy Trial Was Violated While He Was Incarcerated Without Proper Representation Of Counsel For 3-6 Months

8/16

9] Defendant's Attorney, Robert M. Kalec Put Forth Perjured Testimony. Impeding Dismissal Of Indictment, For Violation Of Speedy Trial

1/6

10] Outrageous Government Conduct

1/16

11] Prosecutorial Misconduct And Malfeasance

1/13

12] Judge Borman Displayed Abuse Of/Overstepping Of Discretion

4/1

13] Ineffective Assistance Of Counsel (All Attorneys Of Record)

1/7/12

14] Ineffective Assistance Of Appellate Counsel

1/15

15] Affect Of Cumulative Errors

28 U.S.C. § 2255 Petition/Motion was timely filed in 2014. Stricken from court docketing procedures before the required Rule 4 "Initial Review" was conducted.

09/20/2012	☒ 142	OPINION from U.S. Court of Appeals - Sixth Circuit as to Michael L. Schuttpelz re 107 Notice of Appeal - Disposition: we AFFIRM Schuttpelz conviction. [Appeal Case Number 10-1846] (KKra) (Entered: 01/11/2012)
02/01/2012	☒ 143	MANDATE from U.S. Court of Appeals - Sixth Circuit as to Michael L. Schuttpelz re 107 Notice of Appeal filed by Michael L. Schuttpelz [Appeal Case Number 10-1846] (KKra) (Entered: 02/02/2012)
04/08/2013	☒ 144	LETTER from U.S. Supreme Court as to Michael L. Schuttpelz - The petition for a writ of certiorari in the above entitled case was filed on January 10, 2013 and placed on the docket April 4, 2013 as No. 12-9588. [Appeal Case Number 10-1846] (KKra) (Entered: 04/17/2013)
05/13/2013	☒ 145	LETTER from U.S. Supreme Court as to Michael L. Schuttpelz - The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied. [Appeal Case Number 10-1846] (KKra) (Entered: 05/15/2013)
11/25/2013	☒ 146	MOTION for copies of pretrial transcripts by Michael L. Schuttpelz. (PvM) (Entered: 11/26/2013)
03/04/2014	☒ 147	ORDER REFERRING MOTION to Magistrate Judge R. Steven Whalen: 146 MOTION for copies of pretrial transcripts as to Michael L. Schuttpelz. Signed by District Judge Paul D. Borman. (Monda, H) (Entered: 03/04/2014)
03/04/2014	☒ 148	TEXT-ONLY CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE re 147 Order Referring Motion to Magistrate Judge as to Michael L. Schuttpelz. Documents mailed to Michael L. Schuttpelz. Pris. No. 41686039 at P.O. Box 24549, Tucson, AZ 85734. (Monda, H) (Entered: 03/04/2014)
05/15/2014	☒ 148	Ex Parte Combined MOTION for leave and enlargement of time to file supplemental memorandum of law in support of Motion to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence by a person in Federal Custody and REQUEST of the Court to hold Motion to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence by a person in Federal Custody in abeyance until after the Defendant's 146 Motion for copies of pretrial transcripts is decided by Michael L. Schuttpelz. (DWor) (Entered: 05/15/2014)
05/15/2014	☒ 149	MOTION for leave to file only one copy with this court by Michael L. Schuttpelz. (DWor) (Entered: 05/15/2014)
05/15/2014	☒ 150	STRICKEN PURSUANT TO 01/24/24 OPINION AND ORDER MOTION to Vacate Sentence under 28 U.S.C. 2255 by Michael L. Schuttpelz. (Attachments: # 1 Document Continuation, # 2 Document Continuation) (DWor) Civil case 2:14-cv-11947-PDB opened. Modified on 7/20/2016 (DTof). Modified on 11/9/2016 (DTof). Modified on 1/24/2024 (DPer). (Entered: 05/15/2014)
05/15/2014	☒ 151	NOTICE of Filing a Motion Under 28 U.S.C. 2255 as to Michael L. Schuttpelz (DWor) (Entered: 05/15/2014)
05/15/2014	☒ 152	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE re 150 MOTION to Vacate Sentence under 28 U.S.C. 2255 as to Michael L. Schuttpelz. (DWor) (Entered: 05/15/2014)
05/15/2014	☒ 153	Letter from Michael Schuttpelz (DWor) (Entered: 05/15/2014)
05/16/2014	☒ 154	Notice Regarding Parties' Responsibility to Notify Court of Address Changes (KKra) (Entered: 05/16/2014)

01/11/2024 1:44 PM

pf:1

02/27/2018	☒ 190	ORDER from U.S. Court of Appeals - Sixth Circuit as to Michael L. Schuttpelz re 186 Notice of Appeal [Appeal Case Number 17-1327] (Ahmed, N) (Entered: 06/29/2017)
04/30/2018	☒ 191	LETTER from Michael L. Schuttpelz re status of previous filings (DPer) (Entered: 02/28/2018)
04/30/2018	☒ 192	LETTER with notice of change of address/contact information by Michael L. Schuttpelz. (DPer) (Entered: 05/01/2018)
01/14/2019	☒ 193	LETTER from Michael L. Schuttpelz (DPer) (Entered: 01/15/2019)
04/01/2019	☒ 194	Letter Re Status of Previous Filings from Michael Schuttpelz (SOso) (Entered: 04/02/2019)
08/06/2020	☒ 195	LETTER from Michael Schuttpelz (DPer) (Entered: 08/14/2020)
12/15/2021	☒ 196	LETTER from Michael L. Schuttpelz re status of previous filings; with attachment (DPer) (Entered: 12/27/2021)
01/11/2022	☒ 197	Letter from Michael L. Schuttpelz (SSch) (Entered: 01/11/2022)
12/08/2023	☒ 198	TEXT-ONLY ORDER REASSIGNING CASE from Magistrate Judge R. Steven Whalen to Magistrate Judge Kimberly G. Altman pursuant to Local Criminal Rule 57.10 (SSch) (Entered: 12/08/2023)
01/24/2024	☒ 198	ORDER Denying as Moot 166 Motion for Leave to File One Copy of Notice of Appeal. Signed by District Judge Paul D. Borman. (SPin) (Entered: 01/24/2024)
01/24/2024	☒ 199	ORDER Denying 178 Motion to Amend Court Order re Legal Mail. Signed by District Judge Paul D. Borman. (SPin) (Entered: 01/24/2024)
01/24/2024	☒ 200	ORDER Denying as Moot 181 Motion to File One Copy of Objections. Signed by District Judge Paul D. Borman. (SPin) (Entered: 01/24/2024)
01/24/2024	☒ 201	ORDER Denying as Moot 188 Motion for Leave to File One Copy of Notice of Appeal. Signed by District Judge Paul D. Borman. (SPin) (Entered: 01/24/2024)
01/24/2024	☒ 202	OPINION AND ORDER adopting 161 Report and Recommendation, overruling 182 Objections, granting 158 Motion to strike defendant's motion to vacate, striking 150 Motion to vacate, and denying 159 Motion in opposition to the Government's motion to strike as to Michael L. Schuttpelz (1). Signed by District Judge Paul D. Borman. (DPer) (Entered: 01/24/2024)
01/24/2024	☒ 203	TEXT-ONLY CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE re 202 Order on Motion to Vacate (2255), Order on Report and Recommendation, 199 Order on Motion to Amend/Correct, 200 Order on Motion - Free, 198 Order on Motion for Leave to File, 201 Order on Motion for Leave to File. Documents mailed to Michael Schuttpelz 41686-039, FCI Gilmer, P. O. Box 6000, Glenview, WV 26351-6000. (SPin) (Entered: 01/24/2024)
01/24/2024	☒ 203	Notice Regarding Parties' Responsibility to Notify Court of Address Changes (Jowe) (Entered: 01/24/2024)
01/24/2024	☒ 203	TEXT-ONLY CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE re 203 Regarding Parties' Responsibility to Notify Court of Address Changes as to Michael L. Schuttpelz. Documents mailed to Michael L. Schuttpelz Pris. No. 41638039 at Marion, U.S. Penitentiary, InmateMail/Parcels, P.O. Box 1000, Marion, IL 62959 and to FCI

9/11/2026, 1:54 PM

U.S. District Court
Eastern District of Michigan (Detroit)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:07-mc-50503-GER

Sealed Matter

Assigned to: District Judge Gerald E. Rosen

Cause: No cause code entered

Date Filed: 06/05/2007

Jury Demand: None

Nature of Suit: 890 Other Statutory
Actions

Jurisdiction: Federal Question

In ReSealed MatterPropertyGateway Laptop Computer, Serial 0030162290[Email All Attorneys](#)[Email All Attorneys and Additional Recipients](#)[Copy Page Link to Clipboard](#)

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
06/05/2007	1	Sealed Matter. (CGre) (Entered: 06/07/2007)
06/20/2007	2	Search Warrant Returned Executed on 6/6/2007 as to Gateway Laptop Computer, Serial 0030162290. (SMar) (Entered: 06/22/2007)

MICHAEL L. SCHUTTPELZ on or about June 1, 2007: a Gateway Laptop
Computer Model DS 400E, bearing serial number 0030162290.

A TRUE BILL.

/s/
GRAND JURY FOREPERSON

STEPHEN J. MURPHY
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

s/Jennifer M. Gorland
JENNIFER M. GORLAND
Assistant United States Attorney
Chief, General Crimes Unit
211 W. Fort Street, Suite 2001
Detroit, Michigan 48226

s/John N. O'Brien II
JOHN N. O'BRIEN II
Assistant U. S. Attorney
john.obrien@usdoj.gov
211 W. Fort Street, Suite 2001
Detroit, Michigan 48226
Phone: (313) 226-9715
P39912

DATED: September 18, 2007