FORMAL REQUEST FOR REFERRAL TO ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION

TO: Hon. Jeff Sessions

Office of the Attorney General U.S. Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington 20530-0001 District of Columbia, USA

FROM: Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S., Damaged Party;

Private Attorney General, Civil RICO: 18 U.S.C. 1964; and,

Agent of the United States as $Qui\ Tam\ Relator\ (4X)$, Federal Civil False Claims Act: 31 U.S.C. 3729 et seq.

DATE: April 14, 2017 A.D.

SUBJECT: Administrative Tort Claim to the Administrative Office of

the United States Courts (hereinafter "AOUSC Tort Claim")

Greetings Attorney General Sessions:

I am writing specifically to request formal referral of my pending $\frac{\text{AOUSC}}{\text{Tort}} \frac{\text{Claim}}{\text{Claim}}$ to the most appropriate alternative dispute resolution ("ADR") option, as fully authorized by Acts of Congress including but not limited to $\frac{28}{\text{U.S.C.}} \frac{\text{Section}}{\text{Section}} \frac{2672}{\text{Congress}}$ (to settle any tort claim against the United States).

I also write to make a record of facts which call for the conclusion that my AOUSC Tort Claim has been and continues to be obstructed, resulting in further tortious damages to my good name and estate.

Very briefly, after submitting a series of lawful Requests, beginning April 2010, for the credentials required of certain personnel claiming to be Federal Judges, Magistrates and Court Clerks, all such personnel turned up with missing and fatally defective credentials.

The attached <u>documents</u> constitute material evidence that credentials required by the <u>Oath of Office Clause</u> in the U.S. Constitution, and by <u>Acts of Congress</u> which have implemented that Clause, have turned up either missing or fatally defective for <u>James P. Donohue</u>, <u>William M. McCool</u>, <u>Brian Tsuchida</u>, <u>Zachary Fisher</u>, <u>Nancy D. Freudenthal</u>, <u>Stephan Harris</u>, <u>Tammy Hilliker</u>, <u>Kelly H. Rankin and James C. Duff as Director</u>.

In particular, James C. Duff has either failed or refused to disclose his APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS and APPOINTMENT LETTER appointing him to the Office of Director of the \underline{AOUSC} . As such, he lacked any and all authority to make \underline{any} decisions whatsoever concerning my timely Federal Tort Claim as received by the \underline{AOUSC} on July 11, 2016.

As such, the latter hirelings are now suspected of committing multiple acts of mail fraud, impersonation and racketeering, in violation of the Federal criminal statutes at 18 U.S.C. 1341, 912 and 1962, respectively. Please know that mail fraud is also defined as a RICO "predicate act" at 18 U.S.C. 1961; and, any two (2) such predicate acts are defined as a pattern of racketeering activity at 1961(5).

In order to minimize unnecessary postage expenses and printing costs, please feel free to access the Internet versions of all relevant documents, which are easily accessible at their corresponding URLs.

Executive Recommendation

Given the painfully obvious delays and well documented obstructions which have now occurred with all five (5) of my pending Federal Tort Claims (U.S. DOJ Standard Forms 95), I now believe that arbitration, mediation or other alternative dispute resolution technique should be authorized for my AOUSC Tort Claim, in a prompt delegation from the Attorney General to a fair and impartial "neutral" as presently defined by Act of Congress at 5 U.S.C. 573.

We also take this opportunity to object to any and all DOJ policy(s) which presently require formal litigation to be commenced $\underline{\text{BEFORE}}$ any ADR options can be invoked.

In our professional opinion, such policies appear to defeat the stated intent of Congress to provide damaged parties with <u>practical</u> alternatives to expensive and time-consuming litigation.

In this context, please refer in particular to the Congressional Findings as stated in the <u>Administrative Dispute Resolution Act of</u> 1996, Public Law 104-320, 110 Stat. 3870, October 19, 1996, to wit:

The Congress finds that --

(1) administrative procedure ... is intended to offer a prompt, expert, and inexpensive means of resolving disputes as an alternative to litigation in the Federal courts

[**bold** emphasis added]

Thank you very much, Attorney General Sessions, for your prompt decision to refer this matter to the most appropriate ADR option, pursuant to the intent of Congress expressed at $\frac{28 \text{ U.S.C.}}{2672}$ and in the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act of 1996 supra.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Paul Andrew Mitchell

Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S., Damaged Party; Private Attorney General, Civil RICO: $\underline{18~U.S.C.~1964}$; and, Agent of the United States as Qui~Tam Relator (4X), Federal Civil False Claims Act: 31 U.S.C. 3729 et seq.

All Rights Reserved (cf. UCC 1-308 https://www.law.cornell.edu/ucc/1/1-308)

Cc: Trustee, Estate of Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S.

Enclosures:

http://www.supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim.usdcs/seven.principals.five.accessories.h http://www.supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim.usdcs/page01.gif http://www.supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim.usdcs/page02.gif http://www.supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim.usdcs/usps.tracking.950551545617618700367 1.htm http://www.supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim.usdcs/SF-95.htm http://www.supremelaw.org/rsrc/commissions/donohue.james/nad.appointment.affidavit.htm http://www.supremelaw.org/cc/sebelius/mccool/nad.appointment.affidavit.htm http://www.supremelaw.org/rsrc/commissions/tsuchida.brian/nad.appointment.affidavit.ht http://www.supremelaw.org/cc/hill/fisher/nad.affidavit.htm http://www.supremelaw.org/rsrc/commissions/freudenthal.nancy/nad.affidavit.htm http://www.supremelaw.org/rsrc/commissions/freudenthal.nancy/foia.request.usdc.personn http://www.supremelaw.org/rsrc/commissions/freudenthal.nancy/affidavit.refused.gif http://www.supremelaw.org/rsrc/commissions/freudenthal.nancy/affidavit.gif http://www.supremelaw.org/rsrc/commissions/freudenthal.nancy/commission.refused.gif http://www.supremelaw.org/rsrc/commissions/freudenthal.nancy/commission.gif http://www.supremelaw.org/rsrc/commissions/freudenthal.nancy/letter.2014-07http://www.supremelaw.org/rsrc/commissions/freudenthal.nancy/letter.2014-07-11/page02.gif http://www.supremelaw.org/cc/hill/harris/nad.affidavit.htm http://www.supremelaw.org/cc/hill/hilliker/nad.affidavit.htm http://www.supremelaw.org/rsrc/commissions/rankin.kelly/nad.affidavit.htm http://www.supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim.usdcs/duff/nad.affidavit.htm

http://www.supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim.usdcs/duff/foia.request.duff.htm