



Paul Andrew Mitchell <supremelawfirm@gmail.com>

OBJECTIONS re: missing and defective APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS at USMS, Office of General Counsel; and, IRS, Office of Chief Counsel

Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S. <supremelawfirm@gmail.com>

Sun, Oct 2, 2016 at 12:06 PM

To: Paul Andrew Mitchell <supremelawfirm@gmail.com>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S.** <supremelawfirm@gmail.com>

Date: Sun, Oct 2, 2016 at 11:45 AM

Subject: OBJECTIONS re: missing and defective APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS at USMS, Office of General Counsel; and, IRS, Office of Chief Counsel

To: Mary Russ, OGIS

Greetings Mary Russ:

We have now received the following responses from the Office of General Counsel at the U.S. Marshals Service in Washington, D.C.:

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/bordley/letter.2016-09-26/page01.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/bordley/letter.2016-09-26/page02.gif>

We now detail our standing OBJECTIONS to same, as follows:

We have also scanned and annotated all documents disclosed with the latter Cover Letter (see all hyper-links below).

Kindly confirm that the signatures of all personnel who "administered" each Standard Form 61 have been redacted.

By comparing those redactions with a multitude of other APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS we have received at least since August 2001, we believe you will also confirm how very unusual it is for those signatures to be withheld:

<http://supremelaw.org/rsrc/commissions/evidence.folders.2004-03-16.htm>

We do regard these particular redactions to be more instances of FRAUD.

Please be informed that we do regard such failures to disclose, and such deliberate withholding of evidence, to be more instances of FRAUD -- as defined in Black's Law Dictionary to mean *a failure to disclose what should have been disclosed*.

On the merits, all personnel whose SF-61s we have requested have been duly notified of our "Right to Inspect" their APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS, *notwithstanding* any legislation or rule-making which may appear to abrogate that Right: see Article VI, Clause 3 in the U.S. Constitution, and one of the major holdings in Miranda v. Arizona (*re: Rights secured by the Constitution*).

That Clause pre-dates the Freedom of Information Act by many decades!

Moreover, *The Credential Investigation* has compiled extensive information which calls for the conclusions that the following administrative positions are not "officers of the United States" and they lack Authority to administer APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS, as expressly required by 5 U.S.C. 2903:

Personnel Management Specialist
Personnel Staffing Specialist
Personnel Staffing Spec.
Personnel Assistant
HR Assistant
HR Specialist

Kindly also confirm that some of the Forms listed below do exhibit a proper citation to 5 U.S.C. 2903, and some do not.

Such omissions are further evidence that recent SF-61s do violate the Paperwork Reduction Act and its implementing Regulations chiefly because OMB never approved such changes.

In this context, please study the PRA's Public Protection Clause at 44 U.S.C. 3512:

<https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/44/3512>

(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.

If the Forms listed below were NOT administered by personnel duly delegated with Authority to administer those Forms, all such Forms are thereby rendered **invalid, void and fraudulent** in the first instance.

We must receive sufficient identification of those personnel, in order to make a reasonable determination whether or not the Federal statute at 5 U.S.C. 2903 has been obeyed, or violated, in point of fact.

Our "Reservation of Right to Inspect" their Standard Forms 61 contained links to the following legal NOTICES, which further explain the importance of proper compliance with 5 U.S.C. 2903 *e.g.*:

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/bordley/reservation.of.right.to.inspect.htm>
(see the PROOF OF SERVICE in particular, proving Mr. Bordley did receive the letter via U.S. Mail)

<http://www.supremelaw.org/cc/hedges/United.States.Notice.htm>
<http://www.supremelaw.org/cc/hammond/United.States.Notice.htm>

Kindly also incorporate the following three (3) admissions, written on Federal Government letterhead -- one by the Office of Personnel Management ("OPM"), and two by the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB"):

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hedges/opm/letter.2012-08-06/>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hedges/omb/letter.2012-08-23/>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hedges/omb/letter.2013-01-25/>

Lastly, Mr. Bordley was previously informed of the missing OMB control numbers way back in calendar year 2007: as such, he knew or *SHOULD HAVE KNOWN* about this blatant violation of the Paperwork Reduction Act as lawfully amended and its implementing Regulations as correctly cited and correctly quoted in the legal NOTICE *supra*.

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/brown2/monier/letter.2007-09-25/notice.of.refusal.htm>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/brown2/monier/oath.refused.gif>

We have recently mailed "courtesy reminders" of the latter to Mr. Bordley, in case he forgot.

Therefore, Mr. Bordley's willingness to disclose Forms which also lack the required OMB control number is further evidence of deliberate fraud in this matter.

At this juncture, we should also emphasize that any such Form which displays advice such as "*Prior editions not usable*" is also very suspicious, because the older editions are the only ones which do display any OMB control number, and the Forms which do display that advice do NOT display any OMB control number! Therefore, such advice is necessarily rendered "bad legal advice" in point of law.

For your information, we intend to file a proper FOIA Appeal, and to attach this message and the links below to that FOIA Appeal.

Thank you for your continuing consideration in this very frustrating matter calling as it does for the conclusion that my pending Federal Tort Claim 1 of 5 has been deliberately obstructed in painfully obvious retaliation for all evidence assembled by *The Credential Investigation*:

<http://supremelaw.org/rsrc/commissions/credential.investigation.facts.and.laws.htm>

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

Sincerely yours,
/s/ Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S.
Private Attorney General, Civil RICO: 18 U.S.C. 1964;
Agent of the United States as *Qui Tam* Relator (4X),
Federal Civil False Claims Act: 31 U.S.C. 3729 *et seq.*

<http://supremelaw.org/support.guidelines.htm> (Policy + Guidelines)

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

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S. <supremelawfirm@gmail.com>

Date: Sat, Oct 1, 2016 at 10:40 AM

Subject: missing and defective APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS at USMS, Office of General Counsel; and, IRS, Office of Chief Counsel

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

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/auerbach/affidavit.refused.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/auerbach/affidavit.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/auerbach/state.bar.record.vsb.htm>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/patterson/affidavit.refused.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/patterson/affidavit.gif>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/boehm/affidavit.refused.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/boehm/affidavit.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/boehm/state.bar.record.dcbarm.htm>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/bordley/affidavit.refused.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/bordley/affidavit.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/bordley/state.bar.record.vsb.htm>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/bryan/affidavit.refused.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/bryan/affidavit.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/bryan/state.bar.record.dcbarm.htm>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/choi/affidavit.refused.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/choi/affidavit.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/choi/state.bar.record.ncbarm.htm>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/forder/affidavit.refused.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/forder/affidavit.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/forder/state.bar.record.dcbarm.htm>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/kim/affidavit.refused.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/kim/affidavit.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/kim/state.bar.record.dcbarm.htm>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/kim/state.bar.record.msbaum.htm>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/marcovici/affidavit.refused.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/marcovici/affidavit.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/marcovici/state.bar.record.vsb.htm>

No SF-61 found for Harlow:

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/harlow/letter.2016-09-26/page01.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/harlow/letter.2016-09-26/page02.gif>

No SF-61 found for Dickinson:

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/dickinson/letter.2016-09-26/page01.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/dickinson/letter.2016-09-26/page02.gif>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/dickinson/state.bar.record.dcbarm.htm>

Following FOIA Requests are PAST DUE:

Chan at USMS:

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/chan/foia.request.chan.verified.htm>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/chan/reservation.of.right.to.inspect.htm>
<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/chan/state.bar.record.cobarm.htm>

Day at USMS:

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/day/foia.request.day.verified.htm>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/day/reservation.of.right.to.inspect.htm>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/day/state.bar.record.dcbar.htm>

Radcliffe at USMS:

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/radcliffe/foia.request.radcliffe.verified.htm>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/radcliffe/reservation.of.right.to.inspect.htm>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/usms/ethics.team/radcliffe/state.bar.record.nysba.htm>

Corwin at IRS:

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/corwin/nad.affidavit.htm>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/corwin/foia.request.corwin.htm>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/corwin/reservation.of.right.to.inspect.htm>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/corwin/state.bar.record.dcbar.htm>

Sterner at IRS:

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/sterner/nad.affidavit.htm>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/sterner/foia.request.sterner.htm>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/sterner/reservation.of.right.to.inspect.htm>

Wilkins at IRS:

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/wilkins/nad.affidavit.htm>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/wilkins/foia.request.wilkins.htm>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/wilkins/reservation.of.right.to.inspect.htm>

<http://supremelaw.org/cc/hill/tort.claim/wilkins/state.bar.record.dcbar.htm>

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S.

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

Agent of the United States as *Qui Tam* Relator (4X),

Federal Civil False Claims Act: 31 U.S.C. 3729 *et seq.*

<http://supremelaw.org/support.guidelines.htm> (Policy + Guidelines)

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