```
Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S.
1
2
       Private Attorney General, 18 U.S.C. 1964
3
       c/o Lake Union Mail
4
       117 East Louisa Street
5
       Seattle 98102-3203
6
       WASHINGTON STATE, USA
7
8
       In Propria Persona
9
10
       All Rights Reserved
11
12
13
14
15
                            United States District Court
16
                            Southern District of New York
17
       CHRISTOPHER HEDGES et al.,
18
                                         ) Case No. 1:12-cv-00331-KBF
19
                                          )
20
                 Plaintiffs,
                                          )
21
            V.
22
23
       BARACK OBAMA et al.,
24
25
                Defendants.
26
27
                                          )
28
       United States
                                          ) NOTICE OF MISSING AND/OR
29
       ex relatione
                                         ) DEFECTIVE CREDENTIALS:
30
       Paul Andrew Mitchell,
31
                                         ) 5 U.S.C. 2903, 2906, 3331;
32
                 Interpleader.
                                         ) 18 U.S.C. 4, 912, 1961 et seq.;
                                          ) 28 U.S.C. 453, 951; and,
33
                                         ) 44 U.S.C. 3512(b).
34
```

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

The United States hereby notoriously appears specially, not generally, and ex rel. Paul Andrew Mitchell, Private Attorney General, for the limited purposes of: (1) providing formal Notice to all Proper Parties, and also to all other recipients of the instant NOTICE, (2) satisfying the legal requirements imposed by the Federal criminal statute at 18 U.S.C. 4 (misprision of felony), and (3) establishing probable cause calling for the conclusion that the suspects named infra are engaged in a pattern of racketeering activities, in violation of the Federal criminal statute at 18 U.S.C. 1962(d).

In the interests of expediting access to all relevant and admissible documentation, Interpleader hereby notifies all concerned of a single, consolidated electronic database which now contains evidence of missing and/or defective credentials for past and present Federal Court personnel employed by the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, and by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. In particular, see all "NAD" links infra:

http://www.supremelaw.org/rsrc/commissions/evidence.folders.2004-03-16.htm#SDNYhttp://www.supremelaw.org/rsrc/commissions/evidence.folders.2004-03-16.htm#SECOND

FATAL DEFECTS CONFIRMED IN OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT STANDARD FORM 61 ("SF-61") APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS

Relator now confirms that the Office of Personnel Management ("OPM") never requested <u>nor</u> obtained formal review <u>and</u> approval by the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") of <u>three (3) distinct changes</u> that are plainly evident on the OPM SF-61 APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS now in widespread use, after being made available in electronic form at OPM's Internet website, to wit:

- (1) there is no OMB control number at the upper right-hand corner;
- 20 (2) there is no paragraph at the bottom citing 5 U.S.C. 2903; and,
- 21 (3) the use of an electronic form in lieu of a hard-copy form.

Recent proper requests submitted under the Freedom of Information

Act ("FOIA") specifically sought documentary evidence that OPM has

duly complied with the published Regulations implementing the

Paperwork Reduction Act.

- On August 6, 2012, OPM replied as follows:
- 27 ... [W]e do not have any responsive records here at OPM.

1 And, on August 23, 2012, OMB replied as follows: 2 After careful review of your request, we conducted a search of 3 OMB's files and did not identify any records or documents that 4 are responsive to your request. 5 6 Accordingly, pursuant to the legislative intent of the Paperwork 7 Reduction Act ("PRA"), Relator has every right to enforce that Act by 8 concluding that any and all OPM SF-61 APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS which 9 were never reviewed and timely approved by OMB, as required by 10 published Regulations implementing the PRA, are necessarily "bootleg requests" belonging in the nearest trash can. 11 12 In other words, they are counterfeits! 13 Furthermore, the failure to produce any evidence of any duly executed OPM SF-61 APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS has very far-reaching 14 15 criminal consequences for all Federal employees who are similarly 16 situated. See e.g. 18 U.S.C. §§ 912, 1341, 1951 and 1961 et seq. In particular, concerning the consequences for Federal employees 17 18 who are claiming to be duly appointed to preside on a Federal Court, 19 Interpleader attaches a list of authorities concerning such employees, 20 and incorporates same by reference as if set forth fully here. 21 Those authorities make it very clear that, without taking all 22 required Oaths, one cannot become a judge either de jure or de facto, 23 such an individual is without authority to act, and all his acts as 24 such are void until he has taken the prescribed oath: 25 Without taking the oath prescribed by law, one cannot become a judge either de jure or de facto, and such an individual is 26 27 without authority to act and his acts as such are void until he 28 has taken the prescribed oath. 29 [French v. State, 572 S.W.2d 934] 30 [Brown v. State, 238 S.W.2d 787] 31

1	The Office of the U.S. Attorney General has also issued a long-				
2	standing Opinion which reiterated that the required Oath was a				
3	prerequisite to exercising a judge's duties and to receiving				
4	compensation as a judge:				
5 6 7 8 9	[B]ut whatever form of oath is taken, the taking of the oath is a prerequisite to the entering upon the official duties or drawing salary therefor. [19 Op Atty Gen 221] For reasons including but not limited to those discussed above,				
11	Relator hereby formally invokes the PRA's Public Protection Clause at				
12	44 U.S.C. 3512(b):				
13 14 15 16 17	(b) The protection provided by this section may be raised in the form of a complete defense, bar, or otherwise at any time during the agency administrative process or judicial action applicable thereto.				
18	5 U.S.C. 2903: AUTHORITY TO ADMINISTER				
19	Interpleader also wishes to draw attention to the existence, and				
20	legal implications, of the Federal statute at 5 U.S.C. 2903.				
21	As explained above, the absence of any citation to that statute				
22	is one of the reasons why OPM's electronic version of SF-61 violates				
23	the PRA <u>and</u> its implementing Regulations.				
24	It is also one of the reasons why Relator asserts a <u>right to</u>				
25	inspect all SF-61 APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS for proper compliance with				
26	the stated requirements of that particular statute.				
27	It can happen that Federal judicial personnel have executed what				
28	appears to them to be a complete set of proper credentials.				
29	However, if the individual who administered SF-61 lacks one or				
30	more of the credentials required of $\underline{\text{that}}$ individual, it necessarily				
31	follows that 2903 has been violated.				

1	Let us consider one example, in order to drive this point home:			
2	consider a single SF-61 which appears to have been administered by a			
3	County Dog Catcher. Interpleader does not intend to demean that local			
4	government position: dog catchers perform a very important public			
5	safety service. Nevertheless, the issue is whether or not a County			
6	Dog Catcher is authorized by law to administer OPM SF-61 APPOINTMENT			
7	AFFIDAVITS.			
8	There are three (3) subsections at 5 U.S.C. 2903. Interpleader			
9	wishes to supplement the analysis above with particular emphasis on			
10	subsection 2903(a), to wit:			
11 12 13 14 15	(a) The oath of office required by section 3331 of this title may be administered by an individual authorized by the laws of the United States or local law to administer oaths in the State, District, or territory or possession of the United States where the oath is administered.			
17 18	[<u>underlined</u> emphasis added]			
19	If someone desires to know which individuals are so authorized by			
20	the laws of the United States (Federal government), it is necessary to			
21	do much additional research in order to locate each such law, and in			
22	order to determine from each such law which individual(s) have been			
23	authorized to administer OPM SF-61 APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS, and which			
24	have not been so authorized.			
25	The latter is the situation facing any private Citizen who wishes			
26	to determine the authenticity of any SF-61.			
27	When a private Citizen is confronted with an SF-61 from which all			
28	references to the statute at 5 U.S.C. 2903 have been removed, a not so			
29	subtle fraud has been inflicted on that Citizen by failing to disclose			
30	what should have been disclosed.			
31	Here, cf. "Fraud" in Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition.			

A County Dog Catcher's signature could appear there; and,
without the additional knowledge which notice of this statute
provides, the Citizen is thereby deprived of information necessary to
perform a reasonable inspection of such a document, and to make a
reasonable determination of its legality and authenticity.

Such is the PRA's legislative intent!

Relator here argues that the citation to 5 U.S.C. 2903 should not only be a mandatory requirement on all blank SF-61 APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS duly approved by OMB.

In the spirits of timely notice, full disclosure, and full compliance with the PRA, future revisions of OPM SF-61 should also be enhanced with at least one additional line on which the individual administering that form is required to cite the exact law of the United States or local law which confers upon that individual authority to administer that form.

The latter is really not too much to ask, in light of the obvious vagueness which Interpleader has already documented at 5 U.S.C. 2903(a), in light of the published Regulations which implement the PRA, and in light of the PRA's legislative intent.

Those implementing Regulations expressly mandate opportunities for public comments whenever an OMB control number is up for mandatory renewal every three (3) years.

In fact, those implementing Regulations also authorize <u>any person</u> to request OMB review of <u>any</u> collection of information conducted by or for any Federal government agency, as follows:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Any person may request OMB to review any collection of information conducted by or for any agency to determine if, under this Act and this part, a person shall maintain, provide, or disclose the information to or for the agency. Unless the request is frivolous, OMB shall, in coordination with the agency responsible for the collection of information: (1) Respond to the request within 60 days after receiving the request, unless such period is extended by OMB to a specified date and the person making the request is given notice of such extension; and,
11 12 13 14 15	(2) Take appropriate remedial action, if necessary. 5 CFR 1320.14(c) [underlined emphasis added]
17	INCORPORATION OF ALL ATTACHED EXHIBITS
18	Interpleader hereby incorporates by reference all attached
19	documents as Exhibits, and as if all were set forth fully here.
20 21	VERIFICATION
22	I, Paul Andrew Mitchell, Sui Juris, Relator in the above entitled
23	action, hereby verify under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the
24	United States of America, without the "United States" (federal
25	government), that the above statement of facts and laws is true and
26	correct, according to the best of My current information, knowledge,
27	and belief, so help me God, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1746(1)
28	(Constitution, Laws and Treaties of the United States are supreme Law
29	of the Land, notwithstanding anything in the Constitution or Laws of
30	Washington State to the contrary. See Supremacy Clause.)
31 32 33 34 35	Dated: September 17, 2012 A.D.
36 37	Signed: /s/ Paul Andrew Mitchell
38 39	Printed: Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S., Relator <i>In Propria Persona</i> Private Attorney General, 18 U.S.C. 1964(a)

1	PROOF OF SERVICE				
2	I, Paul Andrew Mitchell, Sui Juris, hereby certify, under penalty of				
3	perjury, under the laws of the United States of America, without the				
4	"United States" (federal government), that I am at least 18 years of				
5	age, a Citizen of $\overline{\text{ONE OF}}$ the $fundsymbol{ ext{United States}}$ of $fac{ ext{America}}$, and that $f I$				
6	personally served the following document(s):				
7 8 9 10 11	NOTICE OF MISSING AND/OR DEFECTIVE CREDENTIALS: 5 U.S.C. 2903, 2906, 3331; 18 U.S.C. 4, 912, 1961 et seq.; 28 U.S.C. 453, 951; and, 44 U.S.C. 3512(b)				
13	by placing one true and correct copy of said document(s) in first				
14	class United States Mail, with postage prepaid and properly addressed				
15	to the following:				
16 17 18 19 20 21	Clerk of Court (3x) U.S. Court of Appeals 40 Foley Square New York City 10007 NEW YORK STATE, USA				
22 23 24 25 26	WILLIAM J. OLSON, PC email: wjo@mindspring.com 370 Maple Avenue West, Suite 4 Vienna 22180 VIRGINIA, USA				
27 28 29 30 31 32	Gary G. Kreep, Esq. [sic] email: usjf@usjf.net U.S. Justice Foundation 932 "D" Street, Suite 2 Ramona 92065 CALIFORNIA, USA				
33 34 35 36 37	Office of the U.S. Attorney 86 Chambers Street New York City 10007 NEW YORK STATE, USA email: benjamin.torrance@usdoj.gov email: christopher.harwood@usdoj.gov				
38 39	Courtesy Copies:				
40 41 42 43 44 45	Friedman Harfenist et al., LLP email: sharfenist@fhkplaw.com Attn: Steven J. Harfenist 3000 Marcus Avenue, Suite 2-E-1 Lake Success 11042 NEW YORK STATE, USA				

1 2	[Please	see USPS Publication #221 for "addressing" instructions.]
3 4 5	Dated:	September 17, 2012 A.D.
6 7 8	Signed:	/s/ Paul Andrew Mitchell
9 10 11	Printed:	Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S., Relator <i>In Propria Persona</i> Private Attorney General, 18 U.S.C. 1964(a)

1996 without a control number.

54

We incorporate as an essential part of this FOIA Request, all of the following relevant excerpts from the *Code of Federal Regulations* implementing the Paperwork Reduction Act, to wit:

[A]n agency shall not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless ... the collection of information displays a currently valid OMB control number. 5 CFR 1320.5(b)(1)

In the case of forms ... sent or made available to potential respondents in an electronic format, the agency places the currently valid OMB control number ... on the first screen viewed by the respondent. 5 CFR 1320.5(b)(2)(ii)(B)

[A]n agency shall not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless ... the agency informs the potential persons who are to respond to the collection of information that such persons are not required to respond to the collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. 5 CFR 1320.5(b)(2)(i)

OMB will consider necessary any collection of information specifically mandated by statute \dots 5 CFR 1320.5(e)(1)

An agency may not make a substantive or material modification to a collection of information after such collection of information has been approved by OMB, unless the modification has been submitted to OMB for review and approval under this Part. $5~\mathrm{CFR}$ $1320.5~\mathrm{(g)}$

OMB shall not approve any collection of information for a period longer than three years. 5 CFR 1320.10(b)

Agencies shall provide copies of the material submitted to OMB for review promptly upon request by any person. 5 CFR 1320.14(b)

Any person may request OMB to review any collection of information conducted by or for any agency to determine if, under this Act and this part, a person shall maintain, provide, or disclose the information to or for the agency. Unless the request is frivolous, OMB shall, in coordination with the agency responsible for the collection of information:

- (1) Respond to the request within 60 days after receiving the request, unless such period is extended by OMB to a specified date and the person making the request is given notice of such extension; and,
- (2) Take appropriate remedial action, if necessary. 5 CFR 1320.14(c)

```
1
       I request a waiver of all fees for this request.
2
3
       Disclosure of the requested information to Me is in the public
4
       interest, because it is likely to contribute significantly to public
5
       understanding of the operations and activities of the Federal
6
       government, and is not primarily in My commercial interest.
7
       See also 5 U.S.C. 552(a)(4)(B).
8
9
       If you are not the correct person to whom this FOIA request should be
10
       directed, please forward it without delay to the correct person(s).
11
12
13
       Thank you for your consideration of this FOIA request.
14
15
16
       Sincerely yours,
17
18
       /s/ Paul Andrew Mitchell
19
20
       Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S.
21
       Private Attorney General, Criminal Investigator and
22
       Federal Witness: 18 U.S.C. 1510, 1512-13, 1964(a)
23
       http://www.supremelaw.org/decs/agency/private.attorney.general.htm
24
25
       All Rights Reserved without Prejudice
26
27
       U.S. Mail:
28
29
             Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S.
30
         c/o Lake Union Mail
             117 East Louisa Street
31
32
             Seattle 98102-3203
33
             WASHINGTON STATE, USA
34
35
       Attachments
36
37
       Copy: U.S. Marshals, Judicial Security, Seattle, Washington State
38
39
       [See USPS Publication #221 for addressing instructions.]
40
```

1996 without a control number.

54

We incorporate as an essential part of this FOIA Request, all of the following relevant excerpts from the *Code of Federal Regulations* implementing the Paperwork Reduction Act, to wit:

[A]n agency shall not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless ... the collection of information displays a currently valid OMB control number. 5 CFR 1320.5(b)(1)

In the case of forms ... sent or made available to potential respondents in an electronic format, the agency places the currently valid OMB control number ... on the first screen viewed by the respondent. 5 CFR 1320.5(b)(2)(ii)(B)

[A]n agency shall not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless ... the agency informs the potential persons who are to respond to the collection of information that such persons are not required to respond to the collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. 5 CFR 1320.5(b)(2)(i)

OMB will consider necessary any collection of information specifically mandated by statute 5 CFR 1320.5(e)(1)

An agency may not make a substantive or material modification to a collection of information after such collection of information has been approved by OMB, unless the modification has been submitted to OMB for review and approval under this Part. $5~\mathrm{CFR}$ $1320.5~\mathrm{(g)}$

OMB shall not approve any collection of information for a period longer than three years. 5 CFR 1320.10(b)

Agencies shall provide copies of the material submitted to OMB for review promptly upon request by any person. 5 CFR 1320.14(b)

Any person may request OMB to review any collection of information conducted by or for any agency to determine if, under this Act and this part, a person shall maintain, provide, or disclose the information to or for the agency. Unless the request is frivolous, OMB shall, in coordination with the agency responsible for the collection of information:

- (1) Respond to the request within 60 days after receiving the request, unless such period is extended by OMB to a specified date and the person making the request is given notice of such extension; and,
- (2) Take appropriate remedial action, if necessary. 5 CFR 1320.14(c)

```
1
       I request a waiver of all fees for this request.
2
3
       Disclosure of the requested information to Me is in the public
4
       interest, because it is likely to contribute significantly to public
5
       understanding of the operations and activities of the Federal
6
       government, and is not primarily in My commercial interest.
7
       See also 5 U.S.C. 552(a)(4)(B).
8
9
       If you are not the correct person to whom this FOIA request should be
10
       directed, please forward it without delay to the correct person(s).
11
12
13
       Thank you for your consideration of this FOIA request.
14
15
16
       Sincerely yours,
17
18
       /s/ Paul Andrew Mitchell
19
20
       Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S.
21
       Private Attorney General, Criminal Investigator and
22
       Federal Witness: 18 U.S.C. 1510, 1512-13, 1964(a)
23
       http://www.supremelaw.org/decs/agency/private.attorney.general.htm
24
25
       All Rights Reserved without Prejudice
26
27
       U.S. Mail:
28
29
             Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S.
30
         c/o Lake Union Mail
             117 East Louisa Street
31
32
             Seattle 98102-3203
33
             WASHINGTON STATE, USA
34
35
       Attachments
36
37
       Copy: U.S. Marshals, Judicial Security, Seattle, Washington State
38
39
       [See USPS Publication #221 for addressing instructions.]
40
```

Authorities in re: Presidential Commissions

When person has been nominated to office by President, confirmed by Senate, and his commission signed by President, with seal of United States affixed thereto, his appointment is complete.

> [<u>U.S. v. LeBaron</u>, 60 U.S. 73, 19 How. 73] [15 L.Ed. 525 (1856), **bold** emphasis added]

The commissions of judicial officers ... appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate ... shall be made out and recorded in the Department of Justice under the seal of that department and countersigned by the Attorney General.

[5 U.S.C. 2902(c), **bold** emphasis added]

Federal circuit and district judges are among the "other officers of the United States" required to be nominated by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

[Thomson v. Robb, 328 S.E.2d 136, 140, hn. 3] [229 Va. 233 (Va. 1985)]

From this clause $[\underline{2:2:2}]$ the Constitution must be understood to declare that all offices of the United States, except in cases where the Constitution itself may otherwise provide, shall be established by law.

[<u>U.S. v. Maurice</u>, 2 Brock, U.S., 96] [26 Fed. Cas. No. 15,747]

... [W]here the law requires a commission to be issued, the person selected is not entitled to the office until the commission issues, and he cannot be legally qualified by taking the required oath until he has received his commission.

The commission is in law prima facie proof of the right of the judge to enter on and perform the duties of his office.

It [commission] is the highest and best evidence of his right to the office until, on quo warranto or a proceeding of that nature, is annulled by judicial determination.

[Thompson v. Holt, 52 Ala. 491] [bold emphasis added]

Without taking the <u>oath prescribed by law</u>, one cannot become a judge either *de jure* or *de facto*, and such an individual is without authority to act and his acts as such are void until he has taken the <u>prescribed oath</u>.

[French v. State, 572 S.W.2d 934]
[Brown v. State, 238 S.W.2d 787]

Law requires the judge selected to take an oath of office.

[<u>U.S. ex rel. Scott v. Babb</u>] [199 F.2d 804 (7th Cir. 1952)]

Appointment was complete upon taking oath.

[Glavey v. U.S., 182 U.S. 595 (1901)]

Judges are required to take oaths.

[7 Op Atty Gen 303]

Oath was prerequisite to compensation of judges.

[7 Op Atty Gen 303]

The salaries of all judges of courts of the United States are due from the date of appointment; but the party does not become entitled to draw pay until he has entered on the duties of his office, or at least taken his official oath; for, until then, though under commission, he is not actually in office; and in some cases, as that of the territorial judges of Oregon, Washington, Kansas, and Nebraska, salary, though due from date of appointment, cannot be drawn until the judge enters on duty in the Territory.

[7 Op Atty Gen 303 supra]

Oath was prerequisite to official duties and salary.

[19 Op Atty Gen 219]

SALARY OF MINISTER

By act of July 11, 1888, chapter 614, the office of chargé d'affaires to Paraguay and Uruguay, the salary of which was \$5,000 per annum, was abolished, and provision made for representing the United States there by a minister at \$7,500 a year. B., who at that time held the former office, was on the 11th of August, 1888, appointed minister. He received his commission at his place of duty on the 3d of October, 1888, and on that latter date took the official oath and entered upon the duties of his office as minister: Advised that B. is entitled to draw his salary as minister from the 3d of October, 1888, the date on which he qualified for the office and entered upon its duties, and not from the date of his appointment (Aug. 11, 1888).

[19 Op Atty Gen 219 supra]

... [B]ut whatever form of oath is taken, the taking of the oath is a prerequisite to the entering upon the official duties or drawing salary therefor.

[19 Op Atty Gen 221 supra]

#