

*

TRULINCS 44202086 - MODELESKI, MITCHELL PAUL - Unit: SET-D-C

* given name

PM

FROM: 44202086

TO: Brown, Thomas; Guenette, Edward; Mullen, Jack; Saccato, Larry

SUBJECT: forward to: <ldobrovolny@scottsbuffcounty.org>

DATE: 05/13/2014 05:46:29 PM

MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

TO:

Hon. Leo Dobrovolny, District Judge

Twelfth Judicial District

Scotts Bluff County Courthouse

1725 - 10th Street

Gering 69341

Nebraska, USA

email: <ldobrovolny@scottsbuffcounty.org>

RE: *People ex rel. Mitchell v. Stephan Harris et al.*

Greetings Your Honor:

PM

Because of the twenty-eight (28) moves I have had to endure since 1/28/2014, I did finally receive TODAY (5/13/2014) your ruling dated April 4, 2014.

In that ruling, you denied my motion to proceed in forma pauperis ("IFP") "as it is not verified before an officer qualified to administer oaths."

Please accept this MOTION respectfully to request your timely reconsideration, for the following good causes:

(1) I remain indigent and, as such, I cannot either afford or earn any filing fees while I remain detained;

(2) My motion to proceed IFP was properly verified pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1746(1) i.e. without (outside) the "United States" (federal government) and inside (within) the United States of America i.e. 50 States of the Union; Nebraska is one of those 50 States, in good standing;

(3) 28 U.S.C. 1746 is rendered supreme Law of the Land throughout Nebraska by virtue of the Supremacy Clause in the Constitution for the United States of America, as lawfully amended;

(4) 28 U.S.C. 1746 was enacted with the legislative intent to eliminate the need for any Notary Public, or similar qualified officer, to administer an oath or affirmation;

(5) For example, 28 U.S.C. 1746 governs the perjury jurat on Internal Revenue Service Forms 1040, which are thereby rendered admissible evidence without the need for a Notary Public, or other qualified officer, to administer or otherwise witness that Form;

(6) Under the common law, I also enjoy the fundamental Right to choose any name I see fit; here, see Doe v. Dunning, 87 Wn.2d 50, 549 P.2d 1 (1976) (re: the fundamental law and basic common-law principle), and Washington State AGO 1985 No. 10 (copy attached via second email message