

15. [Folder of Evidence against William B. Shubb: Impersonating an Article III Judge](#)
16. [91568 28 U.S.C. 372\(c\) Complaint against Dale A. Drozd, USDC/Sacramento](#)
17. [268261 CRIMINAL COMPLAINT against Dale A. Drozd \(9/18/2003\) \(.doc\)](#)
18. [Folder of Evidence against Dale A. Drozd: Impersonating a U.S. Magistrate](#)
19. [9806 Sample FOIA Request for Presidential Commission \(cf. FOIA\)](#)
20. [6884 Sample FOIA Appeal for Presidential Commission \(cf. FOIA\)](#)
21. [38547 Sample FOIA Request for Appointment Affidavit, Oath of Office and Senate Confirmation \(cf. FOIA\)](#)
22. [8123 Sample FOIA Appeal for Appointment Affidavit, Oath of Office and Senate Confirmation \(cf. FOIA\)](#)
23. [11003 Sample Final Notice and Demand for Credentials Required by Law](#)
24. [10554 Sample Notice of Default by Affidavit, 28 U.S.C. 1746\(1\)](#)
25. [6970 Sample Miranda Warning, Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 \(1966\)](#)
26. [7601 Legislative Proposal for Internet Database of Judges' Credentials by Paul Andrew Mitchell to Rep. Tom Campbell \(Oct. 11, 2000 A.D.\) \(.doc\)](#)
27. [Folder with SUBPOENA to A.O. for Appointment Affidavits and Oaths of Office for All Judicial Officers](#)
28. [Folder with FOIA Request for Multiple Credentials \(11/18/2003\)](#)
29. [Folder with FOIA Reply with Multiple Credentials \(3/16/2004\)](#)
30. [10918 Credentials Produced in Reply to FOIA Request \(3/16/2004\)](#)
31. [Letter from District Clerk, CDCA, and Annotated Refusal \(10/12/2004\)](#)
32. [Letter from District Clerk, CDCA, and Annotated Refusal \(11/2/2004\)](#)
33. [16697 NOTICE OF REFUSAL FOR CAUSES, BY AFFIDAVIT \(11/04/2004\)](#)
34. [17505 FOIA Request for All Credentials of All Judges: USDC/EDCA \(11/15/2004\)](#)
35. [7755 FOIA Appeal for All Credentials of All Judges: USDC/EDCA \(12/27/2004\)](#)
36. [18051 FOIA Request for All Credentials of All Judges: USDC/NDCA \(11/15/2004\)](#)

37. [7755 FOIA Appeal for All Credentials of All Judges: USDC/NDCA](#)
(12/27/2004)
38. [Letter from Administrative Office and Annotated Refusal](#) (11/16/2004)
39. [1717 FOIA Request for All Credentials of All Judges: USDC/SDCA](#)
(12/15/2004)
40. [7710 FOIA Appeal for All Credentials of All Judges: USDC/SDCA](#)
(1/18/2005)

Some .gif files were scanned from copies and edited to eliminate stray pixels.

[Return to Table of Contents for](#)

[Supreme Law Library: General Resources](#)

[\[Home\]](#) [\[Write Us\]](#) [\[Library\]](#) [\[School\]](#) [\[Forum\]](#) [\[Subscribe\]](#) [\[Donate\]](#)

Common Law Copyright
1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 A.D.:
Supreme Law Firm

email: supremelawfirm@yahoo.com

Last Update: January 24, 2005 A.D.

1 MEMO

2

3 TO: Mr. Peter D. Shepherd

4 General Counsel Division

5 Department of Justice

6 1162 Court Street N.E.

7 Salem 97301-4096

8 OREGON, USA

COPY

9

10 FROM: Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S.

11 Private Attorney General and Plaintiff

12 Superior Court of California #GIC807057

13

14 DATE: January 14, 2005 A.D.

15

16 SUBJECT: widespread conspiracy in the federal judiciary

17

18 Greetings Mr. Shepherd:

19

20

21 Under separate cover we have mailed to your attention a number of

22 documents which pertain to our ongoing investigation of corruption and

23 racketeering among certain personnel employed by the federal

24 judiciary, particularly in California.

25

26 Our formal investigation began as an essential feature of my federal

27 copyright and trademark infringement case, which was filed in the

28 District Court of the United States in Sacramento, California. See

29 the Lanham Act at 15 U.S.C. 1121 for the Congressional grant of

30 original jurisdiction over trademark infringements. Please be aware

31 that Title 15 of the United States Code has not yet been enacted into

32 positive law; we did, however, confirm that this codified version of

33 the original Statute at Large is presently accurate.

34

35 As that case progressed through the federal courts, all the way to the

36 U.S. Supreme Court, we wish to impress upon you the fact that federal

37 judicial personnel at each step turned up without the requisite

38 credentials. These personnel included Dale A. Drozd and William B.

39 Shubb at the federal district court; Sidney R. Thomas and Stephen S.

40 Trott at the Ninth Circuit; and Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Stephen G.

41 Breyer and Clarence Thomas at the U.S. Supreme Court.

42

43 We have been very pleased to enjoy timely and professional assistance

44 from the U.S. Department of Justice in responding to all of our

45 requests submitted under the Freedom of Information Act. Their strict

46 obedience to all applicable federal laws stands in stark contrast to

47 the utter contempt which federal judicial personnel now exhibit for

48 the U.S. Constitution, Laws and Treaties of the United States. See

49 the Supremacy Clause for paramount authority here.

50

51 Along the way, we continued to document and publish our methods and

52 results in the Supreme Law Library on the Internet. Lately, others

53 have begun to utilize those published resources, and the results they

54 have obtained are remarkably, if regrettably, similar to mine.

1 For example, a client applied our methodology to request all 4
2 requisite credentials for all federal judicial personnel currently
3 seated on the U.S. District Court in downtown Los Angeles.

4
5 Approximately half of those "robes" turned up without one or more of
6 those four credentials. When that client retained me for further
7 counsel, we went the extra mile to notify all affected personnel of
8 the missing credentials, and to demand that they exhibit same within a
9 reasonable deadline. Those missing credentials are still outstanding.

10
11 Given the direction and momentum which this investigation has now
12 taken, we then felt it would be most appropriate to request all 4
13 requisite credentials for all personnel currently seated on the Ninth
14 Circuit and on all U.S. District Courts throughout California State.
15 I am happy to report that proper FOIA requests are now pending for all
16 of such credentials, including also all 45 seats on the U.S. Court of
17 Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, with offices in San Francisco.

18
19 We do also wish to stress that we have succeeded in locating the
20 specific federal statutes which designate the legal custodians of the
21 requisite Presidential Commissions and Appointment Affidavits. Those
22 statutes are 5 U.S.C. 2902 and 2906, respectively.

23
24 Sadly, federal district court clerks continue to refer us to the
25 Administrative Office for the U.S. Courts for those credentials,
26 despite the law which clearly designates the clerk of court as the
27 legal custodian of the Appointment Affidavits for all federal judges,
28 all federal magistrates and all federal district court clerks.

29
30 To exhaust our remedies and demonstrate good faith and due diligence,
31 we served a SUBPOENA IN A CIVIL CASE upon the Administrative Office in
32 Washington, D.C., for all Oaths of Office and all Appointment
33 Affidavits for all federal justices, judges, magistrates, clerks and
34 deputy clerks, no exceptions. That A.O. is now in contempt of court
35 for having fallen silent in response to that lawful SUBPOENA.

36
37 As you can see, Mr. Shepherd, anyone with half a brain can view the
38 evidence we have acquired to date and develop the reasonable
39 suspicion, if not a final conclusion, that **our federal judiciary in**
40 **America appears to be heavily infiltrated by impostors**, who are either
41 unwilling and/or unable to produce the credentials that are required
42 of them by applicable federal laws.

43
44 In our professional opinion, this reasonable suspicion is fully
45 justified by the material evidence now in our possession and, as such,
46 it constitutes probable cause to charge the personnel in question with
47 impersonating officers of the United States, for violating the federal
48 criminal statutes at 18 U.S.C. 912 (impersonation), if not also 18
49 U.S.C. 1341 and 1962 (mail fraud and racketeering, respectively).

50
51 Under separate cover, we have now transmitted to you a quite thorough
52 set of documentary evidence supporting our observations above.

53
54 If my office can assist you further, please don't hesitate to ask.

1 Sincerely yours,

2 /s/ Paul Andrew Mitchell 

3
4
5 Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S., Plaintiff and
6 Private Attorney General, 18 U.S.C. 1964(a):
7 Superior Court of California docket #GIC807057

8
9 All Rights Reserved without Prejudice (see UCCA 1207)

10 copy: Office of the Governor, State of Oregon
11 Hon. Hardy Myers, Attorney General, State of Oregon
12 U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.
13 U.S. Postal Inspection Service, Salem, Oregon
14 Office of Attorney General, State of California, San Diego
15 Foreperson, San Diego County Grand Jury

16
17 p.s. Please feel free to utilize the resources we have now published
18 in the Supreme Law Library, to apply this investigation inside Oregon.

Supreme Law Library : Resources

Required Credentials for United States Judges

[Note: Small numbers indicate number of binary bytes in .gif files.]

Table of Contents

.gif files are Graphics Interchange Format: use any graphics viewer, e.g. MS Photo Editor
.doc files are Microsoft WORD 2002: use **View | Print Layout** in MSIE Version: 6.0.2600 +

1. [Sample Folder with Scanned Forms](#)
2. 10559 [Authorities in re: Presidential Commissions \(.doc\)](#)
3. 10065 [Statutes Defining Legal Custodian of Federal Judges' Oaths of Office](#)
4. 133410 [Sample Form 61 Appointment Affidavit](#)
5. 145099 [Sample Presidential Commission](#)
6. 43819 [Sample Consent by United States Senate](#)
7. 104118 [Sample Oath of Office for United States Judges](#)
8. 7396 [FOIA Request for Supreme Court Commissions and Reply \(11/21/2003\)](#)
9. 5437 [Ninth Circuit "Robes" as of July 1, 2003 A.D.](#)
10. 32911 [MOTION FOR MANDATORY JUDICIAL NOTICE, BY AFFIDAVIT of Evidence against Stephen S. Trott \(2/23/2003\) \(.doc\)](#)
11. 268261 [CRIMINAL COMPLAINT against Stephen S. Trott \(9/18/2003\) \(.doc\)](#)
12. [Folder of Evidence against Stephen S. Trott: Impersonating an Article III Judge](#)
13. 159890 [28 U.S.C. 372\(c\) Complaint against William B. Shubb, USDC/Sacramento](#)
14. 268261 [CRIMINAL COMPLAINT against William B. Shubb \(9/18/2003\) \(.doc\)](#)

15. [Folder of Evidence against William B. Shubb: Impersonating an Article III Judge](#)
16. [91568 28 U.S.C. 372\(c\) Complaint against Dale A. Drozd, USDC/Sacramento](#)
17. [268261 CRIMINAL COMPLAINT against Dale A. Drozd \(9/18/2003\) \(.doc\)](#)
18. [Folder of Evidence against Dale A. Drozd: Impersonating a U.S. Magistrate](#)
19. [9806 Sample FOIA Request for Presidential Commission \(cf. FOIA\)](#)
20. [6884 Sample FOIA Appeal for Presidential Commission \(cf. FOIA\)](#)
21. [38547 Sample FOIA Request for Appointment Affidavit, Oath of Office and Senate Confirmation \(cf. FOIA\)](#)
22. [8123 Sample FOIA Appeal for Appointment Affidavit, Oath of Office and Senate Confirmation \(cf. FOIA\)](#)
23. [11003 Sample Final Notice and Demand for Credentials Required by Law](#)
24. [10554 Sample Notice of Default by Affidavit, 28 U.S.C. 1746\(1\)](#)
25. [6970 Sample Miranda Warning, *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 \(1966\)](#)
26. [7601 Legislative Proposal for Internet Database of Judges' Credentials by Paul Andrew Mitchell to Rep. Tom Campbell \(Oct. 11, 2000 A.D.\) \(.doc\)](#)
27. [Folder with SUBPOENA to A.O. for Appointment Affidavits and Oaths of Office for All Judicial Officers](#)
28. [Folder with FOIA Request for Multiple Credentials \(11/18/2003\)](#)
29. [Folder with FOIA Reply with Multiple Credentials \(3/16/2004\)](#)
30. [10918 Credentials Produced in Reply to FOIA Request \(3/16/2004\)](#)
31. [Letter from District Clerk, CDCA, and Annotated Refusal \(10/12/2004\)](#)
32. [Letter from District Clerk, CDCA, and Annotated Refusal \(11/2/2004\)](#)
33. [16697 NOTICE OF REFUSAL FOR CAUSES, BY AFFIDAVIT \(11/04/2004\)](#)
34. [17505 FOIA Request for All Credentials of All Judges: USDC/EDCA \(11/15/2004\)](#)
35. [7755 FOIA Appeal for All Credentials of All Judges: USDC/EDCA \(12/27/2004\)](#)
36. [18051 FOIA Request for All Credentials of All Judges: USDC/NDCA \(11/15/2004\)](#)

37. [7755 FOIA Appeal for All Credentials of All Judges: USDC/NDCA](#)
(12/27/2004)
38. [Letter from Administrative Office and Annotated Refusal](#) (11/16/2004)
39. [17177 FOIA Request for All Credentials of All Judges: USDC/SDCA](#)
(12/15/2004)
40. [7710 FOIA Appeal for All Credentials of All Judges: USDC/SDCA](#)
(1/18/2005)

Some .gif files were scanned from copies and edited to eliminate stray pixels.

[Return to Table of Contents for](#)

[Supreme Law Library: General Resources](#)

[\[Home\]](#) [\[Write Us\]](#) [\[Library\]](#) [\[School\]](#) [\[Forum\]](#) [\[Subscribe\]](#) [\[Donate\]](#)

Common Law Copyright
1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 A.D.:
Supreme Law Firm

email: supremelawfirm@yahoo.com

Last Update: January 24, 2005 A.D.

Supreme Law Library : Resources

Required Credentials for United States Judges

[Note: Small numbers indicate number of binary bytes in .gif files.]

Table of Contents

.gif files are Graphics Interchange Format: use any graphics viewer, e.g. MS Photo Editor
.doc files are Microsoft WORD 2002: use **View | Print Layout** in MSIE Version: 6.0.2600 +

1. [Sample Folder with Scanned Forms](#)
2. 10559 [Authorities in re: Presidential Commissions \(.doc\)](#)
3. 10065 [Statutes Defining Legal Custodian of Federal Judges' Oaths of Office](#)
4. 133410 [Sample Form 61 Appointment Affidavit](#)
5. 145099 [Sample Presidential Commission](#)
6. 43819 [Sample Consent by United States Senate](#)
7. 104118 [Sample Oath of Office for United States Judges](#)
8. 7396 [FOIA Request for Supreme Court Commissions and Reply \(11/21/2003\)](#)
9. 5437 [Ninth Circuit "Robes" as of July 1, 2003 A.D.](#)
10. 32911 [MOTION FOR MANDATORY JUDICIAL NOTICE, BY AFFIDAVIT of Evidence against Stephen S. Trott \(2/23/2003\) \(.doc\)](#)
11. 268261 [CRIMINAL COMPLAINT against Stephen S. Trott \(9/18/2003\) \(.doc\)](#)
12. [Folder of Evidence against Stephen S. Trott: Impersonating an Article III Judge](#)
13. 159890 [28 U.S.C. 372\(c\) Complaint against William B. Shubb, USDC/Sacramento](#)
14. 268261 [CRIMINAL COMPLAINT against William B. Shubb \(9/18/2003\) \(.doc\)](#)

15. [Folder of Evidence against William B. Shubb: Impersonating an Article III Judge](#)
16. [91568 28 U.S.C. 372\(c\) Complaint against Dale A. Drozd, USDC/Sacramento](#)
17. [268261 CRIMINAL COMPLAINT against Dale A. Drozd \(9/18/2003\) \(.doc\)](#)
18. [Folder of Evidence against Dale A. Drozd: Impersonating a U.S. Magistrate](#)
19. [9806 Sample FOIA Request for Presidential Commission \(cf. FOIA\)](#)
20. [6884 Sample FOIA Appeal for Presidential Commission \(cf. FOIA\)](#)
21. [38547 Sample FOIA Request for Appointment Affidavit, Oath of Office and Senate Confirmation \(cf. FOIA\)](#)
22. [8123 Sample FOIA Appeal for Appointment Affidavit, Oath of Office and Senate Confirmation \(cf. FOIA\)](#)
23. [11003 Sample Final Notice and Demand for Credentials Required by Law](#)
24. [10554 Sample Notice of Default by Affidavit, 28 U.S.C. 1746\(1\)](#)
25. [6970 Sample Miranda Warning, *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 \(1966\)](#)
26. [7601 Legislative Proposal for Internet Database of Judges' Credentials by Paul Andrew Mitchell to Rep. Tom Campbell \(Oct. 11, 2000 A.D.\) \(.doc\)](#)
27. [Folder with SUBPOENA to A.O. for Appointment Affidavits and Oaths of Office for All Judicial Officers](#)
28. [Folder with FOIA Request for Multiple Credentials \(11/18/2003\)](#)
29. [Folder with FOIA Reply with Multiple Credentials \(3/16/2004\)](#)
30. [10918 Credentials Produced in Reply to FOIA Request \(3/16/2004\)](#)
31. [Letter from District Clerk, CDCA, and Annotated Refusal \(10/12/2004\)](#)
32. [Letter from District Clerk, CDCA, and Annotated Refusal \(11/2/2004\)](#)
33. [16697 NOTICE OF REFUSAL FOR CAUSES, BY AFFIDAVIT \(11/04/2004\)](#)
34. [17505 FOIA Request for All Credentials of All Judges: USDC/EDCA \(11/15/2004\)](#)
35. [7755 FOIA Appeal for All Credentials of All Judges: USDC/EDCA \(12/27/2004\)](#)
36. [18051 FOIA Request for All Credentials of All Judges: USDC/NDCA \(11/15/2004\)](#)

37. 7755 FOIA Appeal for All Credentials of All Judges: USDC/NDCA
(12/27/2004)
38. Letter from Administrative Office and Annotated Refusal (11/16/2004)
39. 17177 FOIA Request for All Credentials of All Judges: USDC/SDCA
(12/15/2004)
40. 7710 FOIA Appeal for All Credentials of All Judges: USDC/SDCA
(1/18/2005)

Some .gif files were scanned from copies and edited to eliminate stray pixels.

[Return to Table of Contents for](#)

[Supreme Law Library: General Resources](#)

[\[Home\]](#) [\[Write Us\]](#) [\[Library\]](#) [\[School\]](#) [\[Forum\]](#) [\[Subscribe\]](#) [\[Donate\]](#)

Common Law Copyright
1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 A.D.:
Supreme Law Firm

email: supremelawfirm@yahoo.com

Last Update: January 24, 2005 A.D.

NOTICE AND DEMAND FOR IDENTITY OF AUTHOR

TO: Office of the Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California
220 West Broadway
San Diego 92112-2724
CALIFORNIA, USA

PAST DUE

10 FROM: Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S.
11 Private Attorney General, 18 U.S.C. 1964(a)

13 DATE: April 12, 2004 A.D.

15 SUBJECT: letter dated April 7, 2004 from
16 THE OFFICE OF COURT COUNSEL [sic] with "Encs."

18 To All Personnel in this Office:

20 On Friday, April 9, 2004 A.D., I received Priority U.S. Mail with the
21 letter described above (in original) and several documents which I had
22 previously filed as the Plaintiff in the docket #GIC807057.

24 On good authority, after carefully examining it with the assistance of
25 law enforcement, the letter in question is demonstrably false and
26 fraudulent on its face, for all of the following reasons, to wit:

- (1) it is not on official letterhead;
- (2) it is not signed;
- (3) its author is not identified;
- (4) it contains several typographical errors;
- (5) it contains false and misleading statements, e.g.:
- (6) the Superior Court of California does have jurisdiction;
- (7) case #GIC807057 was never removed into federal court;
- (8) a MOTION TO BAR REMOVAL and a DEMAND FOR RULING on that motion are still pending and now long overdue (as evidenced by the list of documents itemized on pages one and two)

39 Furthermore, the documents enclosed with that letter were previously
40 filed by this Plaintiff in case #GIC807057. When I transmitted them
41 to the Clerk of Court via first class U.S. Mail, they were not punched
42 with a 2-hole punch. A few of the documents which were returned to me
43 were punched with a 2-hole punch, indicating that some or all of the
44 returned documents had at one time been in the Clerk's docket file,
45 and were later removed from that docket file. Such an act of removing
46 filed documents from the Clerk's docket records constitutes criminal
47 tampering with evidence and further evidence of felony mail fraud.
48 See 18 U.S.C. 1341 (also a RICO predicate act).

50 Accordingly, formal DEMAND is hereby made of you positively to
51 identify the author of the letter in question, and also all
52 individual(s) responsible for transmitting that letter to me via
53 Priority U.S. Mail postmarked April 7, 2004, and to do so no later
54 than 5:00 p.m. on Friday, April 16, 2004 A.D.

1 Beyond that deadline, your silence will constitute fraud, pursuant to
2 U.S. v. Tweel; your silence will also activate estoppel, pursuant to
3 Carmine v. Bowen; and your silence will also give me probable cause
4 to place all personnel in your Office under formal criminal
5 investigation on suspicion of tampering with evidence, mail fraud,
6 obstruction of justice, witness retaliation, and conspiracy to engage
7 in a pattern of racketeering activities.
8

9 I attach herewith a sufficient number of documents conclusively to
10 establish that the federal employees and unlicensed attorneys claiming
11 to have "removed" case #GIC807057 are, in fact, named Defendants in
12 the same case who lack the credentials required by State and federal
13 laws; and this fact was previously known to your Office, to the Clerk
14 of Court, and to personnel in Department 71, because they were all
15 served with VERIFIED CRIMINAL COMPLAINTs executed by this Plaintiff
16 against the very same federal employees and unlicensed attorneys.
17

18 Accordingly, it is preposterous in the extreme for anyone claiming to
19 have adequate knowledge of case #GIC807057 to identify any of the
20 named Defendants as "having jurisdiction" over this case, because of
21 the monumental conflicts of interest involved.
22

23 Since when do racketeering defendants have any right to dismiss the
24 civil RICO lawsuit in which they are being prosecuted? Someone in
25 your office must believe that defendants can also preside as judge and
26 jury upon that very same case.
27

28 If this is the low level of "skill" that exists in your Office, then
29 all of you frankly deserve to spend some time in State prison, as far
30 as I am concerned, because you should know better than to permit
31 blatant tampering with the Clerk's docket records in this case.
32

33 If you will please review the pertinent decisions of the U.S. Supreme
34 Court, chiefly Chambers v. Baltimore & Ohio R.R., 207 U.S. 142, 148
35 (1907), you cannot escape confirming that the Petition Clause in the
36 Bill of Rights is the right that is conservative of all other rights.
37 As such, all complaints and other pleadings to State and federal
38 courts are petitions to the government for a redress of grievances,
39 protected by the First Amendment, and not allowing dubious intrusions
40 of any kind whatsoever.
41

42 Therefore, anyone who would attempt in any manner to tamper with the
43 Clerk's records -- by removing a VERIFIED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT -- is
44 thus guilty of infringing ALL of my Rights, without any exceptions.
45

46 I would not normally use such strong language. However, ignorance of
47 the law is no excuse, and ignorance of the facts and related
48 allegations in this case is nothing other than gross criminal
49 negligence, and evidence of aiding and abetting a conspiracy to engage
50 in a well documented pattern of felony racketeering activities.
51

52
53 Thank you very much for your timely cooperation and professional
54 consideration.

1 Sincerely yours,

2
3 /s/ Paul Andrew Mitchell 
4

5 Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S.
6 Private Attorney General and Plaintiff
7 Superior Court docket #GIC807057

8
9 Notice to principals is notice to agents.
10 Notice to agents is notice to principals.

11
12 All Rights Reserved without Prejudice

NOTICE AND DEMAND FOR IDENTITY OF AUTHOR

TO: Office of the Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California
220 West Broadway
San Diego 92112-2724
CALIFORNIA, USA

PAST DUE

10 FROM: Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S.
11 Private Attorney General, 18 U.S.C. 1964(a)

13 DATE: April 12, 2004 A.D.

15 SUBJECT: letter dated April 7, 2004 from
16 THE OFFICE OF COURT COUNSEL [sic] with "Encs."

18 To All Personnel in this Office:

20 On Friday, April 9, 2004 A.D., I received Priority U.S. Mail with the
21 letter described above (in original) and several documents which I had
22 previously filed as the Plaintiff in the docket #GIC807057.

24 On good authority, after carefully examining it with the assistance of
25 law enforcement, the letter in question is demonstrably false and
26 fraudulent on its face, for all of the following reasons, to wit:

- (1) it is not on official letterhead;
- (2) it is not signed;
- (3) its author is not identified;
- (4) it contains several typographical errors;
- (5) it contains false and misleading statements, e.g.:
- (6) the Superior Court of California does have jurisdiction;
- (7) case #GIC807057 was never removed into federal court;
- (8) a MOTION TO BAR REMOVAL and a DEMAND FOR RULING on that motion are still pending and now long overdue (as evidenced by the list of documents itemized on pages one and two)

39 Furthermore, the documents enclosed with that letter were previously
40 filed by this Plaintiff in case #GIC807057. When I transmitted them
41 to the Clerk of Court via first class U.S. Mail, they were not punched
42 with a 2-hole punch. A few of the documents which were returned to me
43 were punched with a 2-hole punch, indicating that some or all of the
44 returned documents had at one time been in the Clerk's docket file,
45 and were later removed from that docket file. Such an act of removing
46 filed documents from the Clerk's docket records constitutes criminal
47 tampering with evidence and further evidence of felony mail fraud.
48 See 18 U.S.C. 1341 (also a RICO predicate act).

50 Accordingly, formal DEMAND is hereby made of you positively to
51 identify the author of the letter in question, and also all
52 individual(s) responsible for transmitting that letter to me via
53 Priority U.S. Mail postmarked April 7, 2004, and to do so no later
54 than 5:00 p.m. on Friday, April 16, 2004 A.D.

1 Beyond that deadline, your silence will constitute fraud, pursuant to
2 U.S. v. Tweel; your silence will also activate estoppel, pursuant to
3 Carmine v. Bowen; and your silence will also give me probable cause
4 to place all personnel in your Office under formal criminal
5 investigation on suspicion of tampering with evidence, mail fraud,
6 obstruction of justice, witness retaliation, and conspiracy to engage
7 in a pattern of racketeering activities.

8
9 I attach herewith a sufficient number of documents conclusively to
10 establish that the federal employees and unlicensed attorneys claiming
11 to have "removed" case #GIC807057 are, in fact, named Defendants in
12 the same case who lack the credentials required by State and federal
13 laws; and this fact was previously known to your Office, to the Clerk
14 of Court, and to personnel in Department 71, because they were all
15 served with VERIFIED CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS executed by this Plaintiff
16 against the very same federal employees and unlicensed attorneys.

17
18 Accordingly, it is preposterous in the extreme for anyone claiming to
19 have adequate knowledge of case #GIC807057 to identify any of the
20 named Defendants as "having jurisdiction" over this case, because of
21 the monumental conflicts of interest involved.

22
23 Since when do racketeering defendants have any right to dismiss the
24 civil RICO lawsuit in which they are being prosecuted? Someone in
25 your office must believe that defendants can also preside as judge and
26 jury upon that very same case.

27
28 If this is the low level of "skill" that exists in your Office, then
29 all of you frankly deserve to spend some time in State prison, as far
30 as I am concerned, because you should know better than to permit
31 blatant tampering with the Clerk's docket records in this case.

32
33 If you will please review the pertinent decisions of the U.S. Supreme
34 Court, chiefly Chambers v. Baltimore & Ohio R.R., 207 U.S. 142, 148
35 (1907), you cannot escape confirming that the Petition Clause in the
36 Bill of Rights is the right that is conservative of all other rights.
37 As such, all complaints and other pleadings to State and federal
38 courts are petitions to the government for a redress of grievances,
39 protected by the First Amendment, and not allowing dubious intrusions
40 of any kind whatsoever.

41
42 Therefore, anyone who would attempt in any manner to tamper with the
43 Clerk's records -- by removing a VERIFIED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT -- is
44 thus guilty of infringing ALL of my Rights, without any exceptions.

45
46 I would not normally use such strong language. However, ignorance of
47 the law is no excuse, and ignorance of the facts and related
48 allegations in this case is nothing other than gross criminal
49 negligence, and evidence of aiding and abetting a conspiracy to engage
50 in a well documented pattern of felony racketeering activities.

51
52
53 Thank you very much for your timely cooperation and professional
54 consideration.

Supreme Law Library : Court Cases

Paul Andrew Mitchell v. AOL Time Warner, Inc. *et al.*

Superior Court of California
Docket #GIC807057

[Note: Small numbers indicate number of bytes in ASCII portion of files.]

Table of Contents

.doc files are Microsoft WORD 2000: use View | Print Layout in MSIE Version: 6.0.2600 +

1. 86641 VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND DAMAGES FROM RACKETEERING, CONSPIRACY TO ENGAGE IN A PATTERN OF RACKETEERING ACTIVITY, AND RELATED CLAIMS: JURY DEMANDED (March 12, 2003 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
2. 7730 TRANSMITTAL LETTER (March 12, 2003 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
3. DOCKET FORMS (March 12, 2003 A.D.)
4. 22155 NOTICE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT (March 12, 2003 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
5. SUMMONS (April 15, 2003 A.D.)
6. 7338 MEMO to Clerk of Court (April 30, 2003 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
7. 42262 MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION BARRING REMOVAL INTO FEDERAL COURT (April 30, 2003 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
8. 18997 FIRST SUPPLEMENT TO MOTION TO BAR REMOVAL (April 30, 2003 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
9. 9627 MEMO to Clerk of Court (May 7, 2003 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
10. 137198 FIRST AMENDED NOTICE OF HEARING ON MOTION TO BAR REMOVAL (May 9, 2003 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
11. 139055 SECOND SUPPLEMENT TO MOTION TO BAR REMOVAL (May 26, 2003 A.D.) ([.doc](#))

12. 13646 PLAINTIFF'S DEMAND FOR RULING ON MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION BARRING REMOVAL INTO FEDERAL COURT (June 13, 2003 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
13. 11003 FINAL NOTICE AND DEMAND FOR CREDENTIALS REQUIRED BY LAW to Irma E. Gonzalez (June 30, 2003 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
14. 10554 NOTICE OF DEFAULT BY AFFIDAVIT to Irma E. Gonzalez (July 17, 2003 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
15. 111763 PLAINTIFF'S REPLY TO ANSWER OF DEFENDANT MSEN, INC. (July 21, 2003 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
16. 268261 PLAINTIFF'S FIRST VERIFIED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT ON INFORMATION (Sept. 18, 2003 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
17. 15692 NOTICE AND DEMAND TO DOCKET PLAINTIFF'S FIRST VERIFIED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT (Oct. 1, 2003 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
18. 10063 NOTICE AND DEMAND FOR EXHIBITION OF OATH OF OFFICE to Peter Eng, The State Bar of California (Nov. 16, 2003 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
19. 7234 MEMO to Clerk of California Supreme Court (Nov. 16, 2003 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
20. 6952 NOTICE OF CURRENT MAILING LOCATION AND DEMAND FOR PROPER DELIVERY AND FORWARDING (Nov. 18, 2003 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
21. SUBPOENA IN A CIVIL CASE to The State Bar of California (Dec. 1, 2003 A.D.)
22. LETTER from The State Bar of California (annotated REFUSED FOR CAUSES) (Dec. 15, 2003 A.D.)
23. 24031 NOTICE OF REFUSAL FOR CAUSES, BY AFFIDAVIT to The State Bar of California (Dec. 18, 2003 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
24. 10784 NOTICE AND DEMAND FOR EXHIBITION OF OATH OF OFFICE to Jay M. Goldman, The State Bar of California (Dec. 18, 2003 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
25. 8842 NOTICE OF CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION to Department 71, Superior Court of California (March 30, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
26. 257272 PLAINTIFF'S SECOND VERIFIED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT ON INFORMATION (March 31, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
27. LETTER from THE OFFICE OF COURT COUNSEL, Superior Court of California (annotated REFUSED for causes) (April 7, 2004 A.D.)
28. 35453 MEMO to County District Attorney (April 9, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
29. 18384 NOTICE AND DEMAND FOR IDENTITY OF AUTHOR to Office of the Presiding Judge (April 12, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
30. LETTER from State of California, Department of Justice (April 12, 2004 A.D.)
31. 15687 REPLY to State of California, Department of Justice (April 14, 2004 A.D.)

32. LETTER from THE OFFICE OF COURT COUNSEL, Superior Court of California (annotated REFUSED for causes) (April 14, 2004 A.D.)
33. 12100 FORMAL NOTICE OF CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION AND MIRANDA WARNING to the Office of the Presiding Judge (April 21, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
34. LETTER from Grand Jury Foreman (April 26, 2004 A.D.)
35. LETTER from Grand Jury Foreman (April 30, 2004 A.D.)
36. 42660 MEMO to Grand Jury Foreman (May 3, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
37. 15178 REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION to Grand Jury Foreman (May 4, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
38. 7732 REQUEST FOR POSITIVE IDENTIFICATION to Grand Jury Foreman (May 4, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
39. 16669 NOTICE AND DEMAND FOR EXHIBITION OF MISSING CREDENTIALS to Office of the Presiding Judge (May 17, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
40. 8173 CITIZEN'S ARREST WARRANT *in re:* Dale A. Drozd (June 17, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
41. 17709 NOTICE OF INTENT TO SUE to Grand Jury Foreman (June 18, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
42. 8720 NOTICE OF FRAUD to Grand Jury Foreman (June 19, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
43. 8930 MEMO to County Sheriff Sgt. Martinez (June 19, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
44. 16563 FORMAL NOTICE OF CLASS DISCRIMINATION IN GRAND JUROR ELIGIBILITY STATUTE to Office of Jury Commissioner (June 19, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
45. 10397 TRANSMITTAL to County District Attorney (June 24, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
46. 8136 REQUEST FOR SURRENDER OF DOCUMENTS to Office of District Attorney (June 24, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
47. 7398 REQUEST FOR POSITIVE IDENTIFICATION to Thomas Eamon McCarthy, Jr. (July 4, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
48. 12874 NOTICE AND DEMAND FOR SURRENDER AND RETURN OF ENTIRE DOCKET FILE to Dale A. Drozd (July 4, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
49. 7300 CITIZEN'S ARREST WARRANT *in re:* William B. Shubb (July 4, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
50. 7130 CITIZEN'S ARREST WARRANT *in re:* Stephen S. Trott (July 4, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
51. 7198 CITIZEN'S ARREST WARRANT *in re:* Irma E. Gonzalez (July 4, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
52. 12874 NOTICE OF REFUSAL FOR CAUSES to Federal District Clerk (July 23, 2004 A.D.) ([.doc](#))
53. 6730 CITIZEN'S ARREST WARRANT *in re:* Morrison C. England (Aug. 4, 2004)

A.D.) (.doc)

54. 6709 CITIZEN'S ARREST WARRANT *in re: Jack L. Wagner* (Aug. 4, 2004 *A.D.*) (.doc)
55. 17411 FINAL NOTICE AND DEMAND FOR EXHIBITION OF MISSING CREDENTIALS to John S. Einhorn (Aug. 25, 2004 *A.D.*) (.doc)
56. 17440 FINAL NOTICE AND DEMAND FOR EXHIBITION OF MISSING CREDENTIALS to Janis Sammartino (Aug. 25, 2004 *A.D.*) (.doc)
57. 7601 NOTICE AND DEMAND FOR RETURN OF U.S. MAIL to the Office of Jury Commissioner (Oct. 21, 2004 *A.D.*) (.doc)
58. 7570 STATUS REQUEST to County District Attorney (Oct. 21, 2004 *A.D.*) (.doc)
59. LETTER from Oregon Attorney General's Office (annotated REFUSED for causes) (Nov. 1, 2004 *A.D.*)
60. 18938 NOTICES OF JUDICIAL DEFAULT (Nov. 26, 2004 *A.D.*) (.doc)
61. LETTER from Georgia Governor's Office (Dec. 6, 2004 *A.D.*)
62. 13809 MEMO to Georgia Governor's Office (Dec. 9, 2004 *A.D.*) (.doc)
63. 8447 REQUEST FOR CERTIFIED COPIES OF OATHS to California Secretary of State (Dec. 20, 2004 *A.D.*) (.doc)
64. LETTER from Oregon Attorney General's Office (annotated REFUSED for causes) (Dec. 23, 2004 *A.D.*)
65. 16981 MEMO to Chief of Investigations, Office of District Attorney (Jan. 3, 2005 *A.D.*) (.doc)
66. CERTIFIED OATH OF OFFICE of John S. Einhorn (Jan. 7, 2005 *A.D.*)
67. CERTIFIED OATH OF OFFICE of Janis Sammartino (Jan. 7, 2005 *A.D.*)
68. 18655 STATUS MEMO to Oregon Attorney General's Office (Jan. 14, 2005 *A.D.*) (.doc)
69. 7839 LIST OF NOTICES AND DEMANDS FOR MISSING CREDENTIALS (Jan. 28, 2005 *A.D.*) (.doc)
70. 34645 LIST OF FINAL NOTICES AND DEMANDS FOR MISSING CREDENTIALS (Jan. 28, 2005 *A.D.*) (.doc)
71. 10909 LIST OF CITIZEN'S ARREST WARRANTS (Jan. 29, 2005 *A.D.*) (.doc)

[Return to Table of Contents for](#)

[**Supreme Law Library: Court Cases**](#)

[\[Home\]](#) [\[Write Us\]](#) [\[Library\]](#) [\[School\]](#) [\[Forum\]](#) [\[Subscribe\]](#) [\[Donate\]](#)

Common Law Copyright

1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 *A.D.*:
Supreme Law Firm

email: supremelawfirm@yahoo.com

Last Update: January 29, 2005 *A.D.*

<http://www.supremelaw.org/cc/aol2/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/cc/aol2/final.nad.all.credentials.2.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/4peakstech.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/aol.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/bempechat/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/bermudez/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/binford/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/bishop/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/blair/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/boe/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/bramson/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/broderick/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/broedlow/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/burns/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/burntfork/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/caltech.edu/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/case/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/cihost.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/clairvoyancecorp.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/cmu.edu/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/condit/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/cornell.edu/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/crone/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/cybergate/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/cyborganic.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/daponde/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/daugherty/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/decarolis/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/deforest/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/deoxy.org/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/dimitri/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/dortch/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/earthlink.net/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/ehlers/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/eigenschink/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/erau.edu/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/evans/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/fahlman/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/farah/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/ferrari/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/feustel/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/fit.edu/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/fong/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/goodkin/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/goodman/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/grant/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/grimme/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/guenard/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/hamerling/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/handelman/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/hargis/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/harrington/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/harrison/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/harrity/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/hartog/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/harvey/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/head/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/herrick/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/hirschfeld/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/hoffman/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>

<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/holst/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/huss/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/imagefx/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/indiana.edu/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/intac.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/ios.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/isaacson/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/jprc.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/justsystem.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/kankel/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/kearney/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/kechejian/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/keller.christopher/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/keller/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/kemp/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/kleinpaste/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/leader/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/lee/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/levy/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/lowell/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/lundberg/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/macklin/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/mahida/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/majeski/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/malcolm/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/martin/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/maui.net/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/mcarthur/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/mcfarland/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/mcmillan/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/meredith/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/meyer/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/mixi.net/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/msen.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/muohio.edu/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/nebonet.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/net2phone.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/networksolutions.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/neu.edu/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/newman/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/nj-law.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/nordbrock/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/ohare/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/parascope.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/parker/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/patti/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/paugh/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/paul/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/pbx.org/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/pearson/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/pennypacker/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/pocsik/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/prevost/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/primehost.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/princeton.edu/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/provide.net/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/psu.edu/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/samudrala/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/schecter/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/schmidt.dan/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>

<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/schmidt.lonnie/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/scott/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/sector13.org/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/seth/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/shackelford/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/simplenet.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/smith/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/snowhill.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/southworth/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/sprawlnet.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/stanford.edu/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/starr/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/stern/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/stetson.edu/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/steuer/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/strasburg/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/sweeney/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/szemiot/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/tarver/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/tek/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/telalink.net/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/textfiles.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/thompson.terence/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/thomson.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/thorburn-gundlach/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/turkette/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/turner/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/tzo.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/uark.edu/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/uci.edu/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/ukans.edu/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/umich.edu/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/uoregon.edu/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/utsa.edu/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/wallen/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/webster/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/wedding/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/weston/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/wisc.edu/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/worldnetdaily.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/xmission.com/final.nad.all.credentials.htm>

<http://www.supremelaw.org/cc/aol2/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/caltech.edu/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/cmu.edu/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/cornell.edu/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/erau.edu/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/fit.edu/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/indiana.edu/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/muohio.edu/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/neu.edu/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/princeton.edu/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/psu.edu/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/southworth/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/stanford.edu/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/stetson.edu/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/turner/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/uark.edu/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/uci.edu/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/uga.edu/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/ukans.edu/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/umich.edu/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/uoregon.edu/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/utsa.edu/nad.all.credentials.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/copyrite/wisc.edu/nad.all.credentials.htm>

1 MEMO

2

3 TO: Mr. Raul David Bejarano

4 Office of the District Attorney

5 330 West Broadway

6 San Diego 92101

7 CALIFORNIA, USA

PAST DUE

8

9 FROM: Paul Andrew Mitchell

10 Private Attorney General and Plaintiff,

11 Superior Court of California docket #GIC807057

12

13 DATE: January 3, 2005 A.D.

14

15 SUBJECT: evidence of perjury by named Defendant

16 Lawrence E. Condit

17

18 Greetings Mr. Bejarano:

19

20 In a recent edition of a local newspaper, I read of your recent

21 appointment as Chief of Investigators. Please accept my sincere

22 congratulations on your new position.

23

24 I am writing specifically to request your prompt attention to the

25 formal allegation of perjury which I have lodged against Lawrence E.

26 Condit, currently a practicing attorney in Tucson, Arizona.

27

28 Although an intake officer in the D.A.'s office reviewed and accepted

29 the documentary evidence that he had requested of me during his

30 initial screening, nothing has happened to my allegation since then

31 (at least nothing of which I am presently aware).

32

33 Here is the factual background of this perjury allegation:

34

35 In 1997, I sued and won a unanimous civil jury verdict in Tucson

36 against Mr. Condit's clients, Mr. and Mrs. Neil T. Nordbrock, for

37 embezzling about three thousand dollars of mine. Within minutes after

38 the unanimous verdict was announced in my favor, Mr. Condit announced

39 to the presiding judge his intent to pay the judgment in full.

40

41 The following Monday, I did receive from Mr. Condit a standard bank

42 check, written on his client trust account in the amount of \$3,113.42

43 payable to me. Immediately after opening the U.S. Mail in which Mr.

44 Condit had transmitted that check, I went to his bank -- the Bank of

45 America in downtown Tucson. I routinely used the services of a check

46 cashing service in Tucson, and I only wanted to ask the Bank of

47 America if the check was good, and to place a hold on the funds.

48

49 The bank teller informed me that there were sufficient funds in

50 Condit's account, but Condit had earlier called to place a stop

51 payment order on that particular check. His reason for doing so was

52 recorded on the bank's computer as "wrong amount." However, the check

53 in question was written for exactly the correct amount of the judgment

54 which the civil jury had awarded to me.

1 I believe it is essential for you to realize that at no time did Mr.
2 Condit accompany me to his bank, nor was he ever an eyewitness to my
3 conversations with any of the bank personnel with whom I attempted to
4 negotiate Condit's bad check.

5
6 Although I did what I could to get relief from this act of bank fraud
7 and mail fraud, the corruption inside the Tucson Police Department,
8 and the Tucson court system, resulted in obstructing every single
9 effort of mine to compel Mr. Condit to make restitution.

10
11 Soon after that, I decided it was best that I flee Tucson, under cover
12 of darkness, due to certain threats to my life and continued safety.

13
14 More recently, I sued Mr. Condit and about 120 other named Defendants
15 in a Civil RICO action in the Superior Court of California in downtown
16 San Diego. See 18 U.S.C. 1964, the list of RICO predicate acts at 18
17 U.S.C. 1961, and "pattern of racketeering" defined at 1961(5).

18
19 Without going into the many complexities that subsequently arose in
20 that Civil RICO case, I wish to focus here on the evidence of perjury
21 which Mr. Condit filed into the official record of that case.

22
23 In particular, Mr. Condit at first attempted to defend himself by
24 claiming that I had made "multiple visits" to his bank and was not
25 allowed to cash his check because, as Condit claimed, his bank would
26 not accept my identification. In point of fact, the question of my
27 identification never arose, and Condit was simply not there to witness
28 my one (1) visit to his bank or my conversations with its personnel.

29
30 I refused Mr. Condit's pleadings to that effect, and annotated them
31 with my claim that his pleadings contained deliberately false and
32 misleading statements. The Clerk of the Superior Court received
33 courtesy copies of those pleadings showing my annotations refusing
34 them. And, of course, I mailed the originals back to Condit.

35
36 Then, in a subsequent pleading, Mr. Condit changed his story and
37 admitted that he had stopped payment on the check in question, but
38 that, as Condit put it (in writing), "His clients [the Nordbrocks]
39 instructed him to do so." In other words, Condit admitted bank fraud
40 and mail fraud specifically because Mr. and Mrs. Nordbrock instructed
41 him to commit those crimes.

42
43 You should also know that Mr. Neil T. Nordbrock is also a named
44 Defendant in my Civil RICO lawsuit; however, Mr. Nordbrock never
45 answered the Initial COMPLAINT or SUMMONS in that case, despite being
46 properly served with same. A PROOF OF SERVICE was properly executed
47 by a Notary Public doing business at that time in downtown San Diego.
48 I have recently mailed to Mr. Nordbrock a NOTICE OF JUDICIAL DEFAULT.

49
50 At this point in time, I honestly believe that it would be appropriate
51 for your Office to inform me -- promptly and officially -- that you
52 intend to do nothing further in this matter, so that I would then be
53 free to move the Superior Court for leave to prosecute Messrs. Condit
54 and Nordbrock in my capacity as a Private Attorney General.

1 In the alternative, I am convinced that the evidence against Mr.
2 Condit is so solid and so far beyond the shadow of any doubt, that he
3 really should be prosecuted by the District Attorney without causing
4 any further delays to the restitution to which I am legally entitled.
5 And, allow me to say that justice would also call for appropriate
6 fines and a prison term for Mr. Condit, if not also Mr. Nordbrock.
7 The Civil RICO statute authorizes an award of triple damages; at a
8 bare minimum, that would equal $3 \times \$3,113.42 = \$9,340.26$.
9

10 My latest query to the U.S. Bureau of Prison's website resulted in
11 information which indicated that a "Neil T. Nordbrock" was recently
12 incarcerated in federal prison, but the reasons for that prison term
13 were not available from the BOP's website. I would expect that more
14 detailed information about Neil T. Nordbrock's sentence would be more
15 readily available to you than to me, given your extensive prior
16 experience with the U.S. Marshals, and also with the San Diego Police
17 Department.

18 Please also know that, during the past year, I enjoyed a very cordial
19 and professional private meeting with 2 duty officers at U.S. Marshals
20 in downtown San Diego, in connection with other criminal matters of
21 which I am a qualified federal witness under 18 U.S.C. 1512 and 1513.
22

23 I remain most appreciative of the assistance they offered to me in
24 that meeting. Please feel free to contact them directly for further
25 details.
26

27
28 Thank you very much, Mr. Bejarano, for your prompt attention to this
29 long overdue matter. I will look forward to hearing from you soon.
30

31
32 Sincerely yours,
33

34 /s/ Paul Andrew Mitchell



35
36 Paul Andrew Mitchell
37 Private Attorney General and Damaged Party
38 Mitchell v. AOL Time Warner, Inc. et al.
39 Superior Court of California docket #GIC807057
40

41 copy: U.S. Marshals, Duty Officers, downtown San Diego
42

43 U.S. Mail:
44

45 c/o Forwarding Agent
46 501 W. Broadway #A-332
47 San Diego 92101
48 CALIFORNIA, USA
49

50
51 **All Rights Reserved without Prejudice**

1 MEMO
2

3 TO: Mr. Raul David Bejarano
4 Office of the District Attorney
5 330 West Broadway
6 San Diego 92101
7 CALIFORNIA, USA

PAST DUE

8
9 FROM: Paul Andrew Mitchell
10 Private Attorney General and Plaintiff,
11 Superior Court of California docket #GIC807057

12 DATE: January 3, 2005 A.D.

13
14 SUBJECT: evidence of perjury by named Defendant
15 Lawrence E. Condit

16
17 Greetings Mr. Bejarano:

18
19 In a recent edition of a local newspaper, I read of your recent
20 appointment as Chief of Investigators. Please accept my sincere
21 congratulations on your new position.

22
23 I am writing specifically to request your prompt attention to the
24 formal allegation of perjury which I have lodged against Lawrence E.
25 Condit, currently a practicing attorney in Tucson, Arizona.

26
27 Although an intake officer in the D.A.'s office reviewed and accepted
28 the documentary evidence that he had requested of me during his
29 initial screening, nothing has happened to my allegation since then
30 (at least nothing of which I am presently aware).

31
32 Here is the factual background of this perjury allegation:

33
34 In 1997, I sued and won a unanimous civil jury verdict in Tucson
35 against Mr. Condit's clients, Mr. and Mrs. Neil T. Nordbrock, for
36 embezzling about three thousand dollars of mine. Within minutes after
37 the unanimous verdict was announced in my favor, Mr. Condit announced
38 to the presiding judge his intent to pay the judgment in full.

39
40 The following Monday, I did receive from Mr. Condit a standard bank
41 check, written on his client trust account in the amount of \$3,113.42
42 payable to me. Immediately after opening the U.S. Mail in which Mr.
43 Condit had transmitted that check, I went to his bank -- the Bank of
44 America in downtown Tucson. I routinely used the services of a check
45 cashing service in Tucson, and I only wanted to ask the Bank of
46 America if the check was good, and to place a hold on the funds.

47
48 The bank teller informed me that there were sufficient funds in
49 Condit's account, but Condit had earlier called to place a stop
50 payment order on that particular check. His reason for doing so was
51 recorded on the bank's computer as "wrong amount." However, the check
52 in question was written for exactly the correct amount of the judgment
53 which the civil jury had awarded to me.

54

1 I believe it is essential for you to realize that at no time did Mr.
2 Condit accompany me to his bank, nor was he ever an eyewitness to my
3 conversations with any of the bank personnel with whom I attempted to
4 negotiate Condit's bad check.

5
6 Although I did what I could to get relief from this act of bank fraud
7 and mail fraud, the corruption inside the Tucson Police Department,
8 and the Tucson court system, resulted in obstructing every single
9 effort of mine to compel Mr. Condit to make restitution.

10
11 Soon after that, I decided it was best that I flee Tucson, under cover
12 of darkness, due to certain threats to my life and continued safety.

13
14 More recently, I sued Mr. Condit and about 120 other named Defendants
15 in a Civil RICO action in the Superior Court of California in downtown
16 San Diego. See 18 U.S.C. 1964, the list of RICO predicate acts at 18
17 U.S.C. 1961, and "pattern of racketeering" defined at 1961(5).

18
19 Without going into the many complexities that subsequently arose in
20 that Civil RICO case, I wish to focus here on the evidence of perjury
21 which Mr. Condit filed into the official record of that case.

22
23 In particular, Mr. Condit at first attempted to defend himself by
24 claiming that I had made "multiple visits" to his bank and was not
25 allowed to cash his check because, as Condit claimed, his bank would
26 not accept my identification. In point of fact, the question of my
27 identification never arose, and Condit was simply not there to witness
28 my one (1) visit to his bank or my conversations with its personnel.

29
30 I refused Mr. Condit's pleadings to that effect, and annotated them
31 with my claim that his pleadings contained deliberately false and
32 misleading statements. The Clerk of the Superior Court received
33 courtesy copies of those pleadings showing my annotations refusing
34 them. And, of course, I mailed the originals back to Condit.

35
36 Then, in a subsequent pleading, Mr. Condit changed his story and
37 admitted that he had stopped payment on the check in question, but
38 that, as Condit put it (in writing), "His clients [the Nordbrocks]
39 instructed him to do so." In other words, Condit admitted bank fraud
40 and mail fraud specifically because Mr. and Mrs. Nordbrock instructed
41 him to commit those crimes.

42
43 You should also know that Mr. Neil T. Nordbrock is also a named
44 Defendant in my Civil RICO lawsuit; however, Mr. Nordbrock never
45 answered the Initial COMPLAINT or SUMMONS in that case, despite being
46 properly served with same. A PROOF OF SERVICE was properly executed
47 by a Notary Public doing business at that time in downtown San Diego.
48 I have recently mailed to Mr. Nordbrock a NOTICE OF JUDICIAL DEFAULT.

49
50 At this point in time, I honestly believe that it would be appropriate
51 for your Office to inform me -- promptly and officially -- that you
52 intend to do nothing further in this matter, so that I would then be
53 free to move the Superior Court for leave to prosecute Messrs. Condit
54 and Nordbrock in my capacity as a Private Attorney General.

1 In the alternative, I am convinced that the evidence against Mr.
2 Condit is so solid and so far beyond the shadow of any doubt, that he
3 really should be prosecuted by the District Attorney without causing
4 any further delays to the restitution to which I am legally entitled.
5 And, allow me to say that justice would also call for appropriate
6 fines and a prison term for Mr. Condit, if not also Mr. Nordbrock.
7 The Civil RICO statute authorizes an award of triple damages; at a
8 bare minimum, that would equal 3 x \$3,113.42 = \$9,340.26.
9

10 My latest query to the U.S. Bureau of Prison's website resulted in
11 information which indicated that a "Neil T. Nordbrock" was recently
12 incarcerated in federal prison, but the reasons for that prison term
13 were not available from the BOP's website. I would expect that more
14 detailed information about Neil T. Nordbrock's sentence would be more
15 readily available to you than to me, given your extensive prior
16 experience with the U.S. Marshals, and also with the San Diego Police
17 Department.

18
19 Please also know that, during the past year, I enjoyed a very cordial
20 and professional private meeting with 2 duty officers at U.S. Marshals
21 in downtown San Diego, in connection with other criminal matters of
22 which I am a qualified federal witness under 18 U.S.C. 1512 and 1513.

23
24 I remain most appreciative of the assistance they offered to me in
25 that meeting. Please feel free to contact them directly for further
26 details.

27
28
29 Thank you very much, Mr. Bejarano, for your prompt attention to this
30 long overdue matter. I will look forward to hearing from you soon.

31
32
33 Sincerely yours,

34
35 /s/ Paul Andrew Mitchell 

36
37 Paul Andrew Mitchell
38 Private Attorney General and Damaged Party
39 Mitchell v. AOL Time Warner, Inc. et al.
40 Superior Court of California docket #GIC807057

41
42 copy: U.S. Marshals, Duty Officers, downtown San Diego

43
44 U.S. Mail:

45
46 c/o Forwarding Agent
47 501 W. Broadway #A-332
48 San Diego 92101
49 CALIFORNIA, USA

50
51 **All Rights Reserved without Prejudice**