

#3

Case No. MJ 14-00030 JPD

REQUEST TO VACATE DECISIONS
AND HEARINGS BY JAMES P. DONOHUE

TO: Chief Judge, duly credentialed
U.S. District Court
700 Stewart Street
Seattle 98101
Washington State, USA
Ref. #14-CR-27-F
(USDC/DWY)

FROM: Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S.
FDC Seatac Reg. No. 44202-086, Unit "EA"

SUBJECT: James P. Donohue's conflict
of interest and demonstrable bias

Greetings Your Honor:
Start by reviewing Martinez v. Winner, 771 F.2d 424.
Please allow me to begin this REQUEST
by confirming that Mr. James P. Donohue
has failed to produce any evidence of a
valid OPM SF-61 APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS.

Moreover, I have made that request
in writing, which Mr. Donohue did not
answer, and personally at the Clerk's
public court on 6/11/2013. An employee
of the Clerk's Office replied: "We are not
going to cooperate with you Mr. Mitchell."
Mr. Donohue's signature, as I recall,
was visible on the "search warrant" [sic]
to which I objected on 6/11/2013, chiefly
because I have never had any opportunity
Also in violation of 28 U.S.C. 1691, that
"search warrant" did not display any

Incorporated by reference in #14-CR-27-F (USDC/DWY)

To inspect
....
-1 of 4-

Incorporated by reference in #14-CR-27-F (USDC/DWY)

signature of any Clerk or ^{Deputy} Clerk of Court; it did show a rubber stamp bearing the name of "William M. McCool" who has also refused to produce any evidence of a valid OPM SF-61 APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS, as required by 5 U.S.C. 2903, 2906, 3331, and the Oath of Office Clause.

Furthermore, Mr. Donohue has manifested bias and apparent prejudice specifically in the "DETENTION ORDER" dated January 31, 2014. For example: Using U.S. v. Callender, 25 F. Cas. 239 (1800) as a guide:

(a) "Defendant has made it clear he will not go to the District of Wyoming willingly, [sic]"

Objection: I have no car, no driver's license, and I ^{JUST} barely have enough money saved to pay 2 months of rent. Travel is out of the question to visit a distant city, as soon as I am expected to pay travel costs etc.

(b) Defendant does not believe the Court has authority over him and will not comply with Court Orders. [sic]

The record shows I timely challenged jurisdiction. I timely objected, and my objection was "noted".

Pursuant to case law I have already studied under 28 U.S.C. 1691, violations of that law do deprive the Court of jurisdiction in personam. Likewise, Court "orders" are process as that term occurs in Sec. 1691.

As a point of law, the Court does lack "authority over me" as long as it lacks jurisdiction in personam. 28 U.S.C. 1691.

Incorporated by reference in #14-CR-27-F (USDC/DWY)

(c) "There are no conditions or combination of conditions other than detention that will reasonably assure the appearance of defendant as required in the District of Wyoming." [sic]

That exaggerated and foregone conclusion overlooked the obvious: I can appear in writing at preliminary hearings held in Cheyenne, Wyoming, provided I am released on my own recognizance ("OR") and allowed to prepare my own defense, using the powerful computer resources I have assembled in my apartment.

paragraph 8M

"House arrest" is another option, provided I be allowed to return to my apartment, as described in the preceding ~~paragraph~~ ^{paragraph} and I am presently at real risk of LASTING that apartment and ALL of my personal and professional possessions. Why? Reprisal?

Was that the REAL reason for the lightning bolt arrest on 1/28/2014, and the cruel and unusual punishment of expediting me NON-STOP to solitary confinement, orchestrated by lies, defamations and distortions? WHY??? Is there a conspiracy to violate rights guaranteed by the Constitution?
- REMEDIES -

The facts above fully justify an ORDER to the OUSA to show cause why (a) Mr. Donohue's rulings & hearings should not be vacated and ^{why} (b) Defendant should not be released on his own recognizance so that he may prepare his defense to Propria Persona on his own computers.

Incorporated by reference in #14-CR-27-F (USDc/DWY)

VERIFICATION: 28 U.S.C. 1746

I, Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S.,
 hereby verify under penalty of perjury,
 under the laws of the United States of
 America, without (outside) the United
 States (Federal government) that the
 above statement of facts and laws
 is true and correct, according to the
 best of my current information, knowledge,
 and belief, so help me God.

Dated: 2/8/2014

Signed: Paul Andrew Mitchell
 for Propria Persona (NOT "Pro Se")

Printed: Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S.
 All Rights Reserved (cf. VCC 1-308)

Authority: Martinez v. Winner, 771 F.2d 424 (10th Cir. 1985)
 p.s. "Pro se" in Latin means "For it"

in English: "se" is a neuter Latin
 pronoun that is inappropriate when
 used to refer to human beings,
 particularly Citizens of ONE OF the States united.
 "Quem ad finem sese effrenata iactabit
 audacia?" (in Latin)

To what end will your unbridled
 audacity hurl itself? (in English)

Cicero's Oration against Cataline
See Pannill v. Roanoke here.