

#9

Paul Andrew Mitchell, Sui Juris
% 117 E. Louisa Street
Seattle 98102-3203
Washington State, USA

In Propria Persona and
In Forma Pauperis
All Rights Reserved (cf. vcc 1-308)

United States District Court
District of Washington

(JPD)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA [sic]) Case No. MJ-14-00030A
Plaintiff [sic],) Re: 14-CR-27-F (Dwy)
v.) (incorporated by reference)
JOSEPH RUBEN HILL [sic] et al. }

United States ex rel.)
Paul Andrew Mitchell,) AND MOTION FOR
Relator Sui Juris,) INTERLOCUTORY
Cross-Plaintiff.) JUDGMENT;
28 U.S.C. 1345, 1691;
FREV 201(c)(2).

Comes now the United States ex relatione
Paul Andrew, Citizen of Washington State,
qualified Federal Witness and Private Attorney
General, to petition this honorable Court
for a timely interlocutory judgment by a
duly credentialed U.S. District Judge concerning
the applicability of 28 U.S.C. 1691 to
"ARREST WARRANTS" and "INDICTMENTS".

See 28 U.S.C.A. 1691 and 28 U.S.C.S. 1691, all
case law and abstracts listed thereunder.

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

The alleged "INDICTMENT" in the instant case displays a standard machine date-and-time stamp with the ALL CAPS text "STEPHAN HARRIS, CLERK CHEYENNE".

However, there are no wet-ink signatures by the latter that are plainly evident anywhere on said document. (See 28 U.S.C. 1691).

Page

On Page 6, there are what appear to be wet-ink signatures by one CHRISTOPHER A. CROFTS [sic], United States Attorney, [sic], and by one Debra J. Halthus [sic], FOREPERSON [sic].

Section 1691 requires the authorized signature of a Clerk of Court, or a Deputy Clerk of Court. See 28 U.S.C.A. & U.S.C.S. 1691.

The offices of U.S. Attorney and the position of FOREPERSON are not mentioned.

Cross-Plaintiff concludes from the above that Section 1691 is not satisfied when process styled "INDICTMENT" is signed by a U.S. Attorney, or by a FOREPERSON.

Similarly, Cross-Plaintiff also concludes from the above that Section 1691 is not satisfied when process styled "ARREST WARRANT" fails to display a Clerk's authorized signature and the Court's official seal.

For the same reason explained in the preceding paragraph, Section 1691 is not satisfied when process styled "SEARCH WARRANT" fails to display a Clerk's authorized signature and the Court's official seal. Here, see 28 U.S.C. 951; 5 U.S.C. 2104, 2903, 2906, 3331, 3332, 3333; 44 U.S.C. 3507, 3512; 18 U.S.C. 241, 242, 1341; 42 U.S.C. 1985, 1986.

#9

REMEDY REQUESTED

IND

All of the above premises having been duly considered, Cross-Plaintiff hereby respectfully requests an interlocutory judgment holding that, as a matter of law, the statute at 28 U.S.C. 1691 does impose upon "INDICTMENTS", and upon "ARREST WARRANTS", and upon "SEARCH WARRANTS", the requirements of a Clerk's authorized signature and the Court's official seal.

Moreover, 28 U.S.C. 1691 was first enacted on June 25, 1948 and subsequently was never amended, nor repealed, by Act of Congress. Cf. 62 Stat. See also U.S. v. Pignatiello, 582 F.Supp. 251 (1984).

VERIFICATION

I, Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S., Sui Juris, Citizen of Washington State, expressly not a "federal citizen", also a qualified Federal Witness, and Private Attorney General, hereby verify under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the United States of America, without the United States (federal government), that the above statement of facts and laws is true and correct, to the best of my current information, knowledge and belief, so help me God, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1746.

Dated: January 31, 2014 A.D.

(mailing delayed due to witness intimidation, retaliation)

Signed: Paul Andrew Mitchell, Sui Juris

Printed: Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S.