

TRULINCS 44202086 - MODELESKI, MITCHELL PAUL - Unit: SPG-G-P

FROM: 44202086
TO: Brown, Thomas; Saccato, Larry
SUBJECT: APPLICATION FOR DISQUALIFICATIONS [1 of 2]
DATE: 10/03/2014 10:20:28 AM

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF WYOMING
2014 OCT 14 PM 3 31
STEPHAN HARRIS, CLERK
CHEYENNE

Docket No. 2:14-CR-00027-NDF

TO:
U.S. District Court
2120 Capitol Avenue, 2nd Floor
Cheyenne 82001
Wyoming, USA

Subject: APPLICATION FOR DISQUALIFICATIONS: 28 USC 144

Greetings Your Honor:

Comes now Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S. ("Mitchell"), to apply for mandatory disqualifications of Nancy D. Freudenthal and possibly also Scott W. Skavdahl and Alan B. Johnson from the instant criminal case, pursuant to 28 USC 144, for good causes showing as follows:

AFFIDAVIT OF BIAS AND PREJUDICE

Notably, at the hearing on 3/21/2014, Ms. Freudenthal clearly attempted to characterize Mitchell's ongoing credential investigation as some sort of pathological obsession (or similar words to that same effect).

Mitchell promptly objected by emphasizing that the credential investigation was being performed on behalf of private clients who paid fair professional fees for that service.

The credential investigation has also been actively assisted by Federal officers in DOJ's Office of Information Policy ("OIP") and the Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys ("EOUSA") in Washington, D.C., with actual knowledge of Deputy U.S. Marshals in San Diego, Spokane and Seattle.

Such official assistance consisted mainly of timely and untimely replies and production of partial documents responsive to Mitchell's numerous Requests, properly submitted under the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"), 5 USC 552, in addition to in-person meetings with Deputy U.S. Marshals in San Diego and Seattle.

To date, Mitchell has had five (5) in-person meetings with one or more Deputy U.S. Marshals stationed in Seattle, and two (2) in-person meetings with Deputy U.S. Marshals stationed in San Diego.

Near the conclusion of the 3/21/2014 hearing, Freudenthal actually apologized to Mitchell for her attempt to characterize the credential investigation, and its cumulative results to date, as the obsession of someone suffering from a mental illness of some kind.

Mitchell continues to regard that attempt as defamatory, and defamation violates two (2) Human Rights Treaties -- the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International

- 1 of 13 -

TRULINCS 44202086 - MODELESKI, MITCHELL PAUL - Unit: SPG-G-P

Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. (See VCC5 infra.)

Then, without Mitchell's actual knowledge, Mr. L. Robert Murray dba Assistant U.S. Attorney, commenced to file a "secret motion" -- ex parte -- for a second psychological evaluation of Mitchell at FDC/SeaTac. That ex parte motion was never timely served upon Mitchell; no notice of any hearing on that ex parte motion was ever served upon Mitchell; and, no hearing on that ex parte motion was ever conducted at which Mitchell was allowed to appear. (See Code of Conduct, Canon 3(A)(4) infra.)

Mitchell has always proceeded In Propria Persona i.e. "personally" under 28 USC 1654, notwithstanding any and all appearances to the contrary.

In point of fact, Mr. Mark Hardee as initial "standby counsel" failed completely to forward or even to mention said ex parte motion to Mitchell; and, Docket records were erroneously modified -- by person(s) unknown -- so as to list Mr. Hardee as Mitchell's formal legal "representative", directly contradicting Mitchell's decision to proceed always In Propria Persona.

Freudenthal summarily "granted" said ex parte motion, but Mitchell was not allowed to see any "order" granting that ex parte motion until after he arrived at FDC/SeaTac for a second period of detention and more solitary confinement.

In point of fact, Hardee also failed completely to forward or even to mention to Mitchell said "order" granting that ex parte motion.

Mitchell has also confirmed a Federal law which prohibits Federal Judges from engaging in the practice of law, and defines that violation as a high misdemeanor. (See 28 USC 454.)

All psychological interviews of Mitchell by one Cynthia A. Low, dba Forensic Psychologist, were conducted at FDC/SeaTac at all times withOUT the assistance of Counsel present during those interviews, and over Mitchell's multiple written objections to the total absence of Counsel, and to all missing credentials for one Stephan Harris whose name appeared in the conforming stamp displayed on Freudenthal's "order".

Relying upon information provided by the U.S. Supreme Court in Johnson v. Zerbst, 304 U.S. 458, 468 (1938), Mitchell believes the complete absence of counsel during all of Low's interviews resulted in ousting this Court of jurisdiction (cf. "jurisdictional bar", "court no longer has jurisdiction to proceed").

Mitchell has never competently and never intelligently waived his Fundamental right to meaningful technical assistance of "standby" counsel. Here, Mitchell relies upon U.S. v. Coupeze, 603 F.2d 1347 (9th Cir. 1979) (re: "meaningful technical assistance"), and upon similar case law under 28 USC 1654. Near the end of the 3/21/2014 hearing, Mitchell expressly reserved his Right to change his mind about formal legal representation, and Freudenthal acknowledged same on the record.

Mitchell has previously filed a DEMAND FOR RECUSAL which expanded substantially upon the several reasons why he believes Freudenthal's bias and prejudice do warrant her immediate disqualification.

TRULINCS 44202086 - MODELESKI, MITCHELL PAUL - Unit: SPG-G-P

Said DEMAND FOR RECUSAL is hereby incorporated by reference, as if set forth fully here.

(See Docket records for the particulars of that DEMAND FOR RECUSAL.)

Chiefly, while being detained unlawfully in Gering, Nebraska, Mitchell submitted a proper FOIA Request to OIP for the four (4) credentials required of Freudenthal, Skavdahl and Johnson. All three (3) of said Court personnel turned up with missing and/or defective credentials: OIP produced no SENATE CONFIRMATIONS for any of those 3 personnel, and also no APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS or OATH OF OFFICE for Johnson. (See 28 U.S.C. 453 and 5 USC 2104, 2902, 2903, 3331, 3332, 3333, 5507.)

Also, on information Mitchell concluded the APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS for Freudenthal and Skavdahl were visibly counterfeit forms; and, the PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSIONS for Freudenthal and Skavdahl were incomplete because of the visibly counterfeit APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS executed by one Eric Holder, Jr., formerly dba U.S. Attorney General. (See 44 USC 3512.)

Mitchell has confirmed that the Federal statute at 5 USC 2902(c) requires the U.S. Attorney General to countersign all PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSIONS of judicial officers e.g. district judges, also U.S. attorneys and U.S. marshals.

Mitchell has also diligently studied the Appointments Clause and the Recess Appointments Clause in the U.S. Constitution. He concluded therefrom that a SENATE CONFIRMATION is absolutely required of Freudenthal, Skavdahl and Johnson: the absence of that key mandatory credential also invalidates any and all other credentials, such as the PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION, APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS and OATH OFFICE, chiefly because the SENATE CONFIRMATION cannot be bypassed or circumvented indefinitely.

Even for recess appointments under Article II, Section 2, Clause 3 in the U.S. Constitution ("2:2:3"), Mitchell found case law holding that the U.S. Senate's formal advice and consent must follow during the next ensuing Senate session. Here, Mitchell relies upon the decision in Noel Canning v. NLRB, 705 F.3d 490 (D.C. Cir. 2013).

Prior to his FOIA Request for her four (4) credentials, Mitchell did mail to Freudenthal a proper DEMAND for disclosing a copy of her APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS. A copy of that DEMAND should be filed in this Court's Docket records. Freudenthal never answered that DEMAND (see further discussion of "demand" infra).

Mitchell also believes Freudenthal suffers from a severe conflict of interest that results from her failure to exercise adequate administrative supervision of Court subordinates such as Stephan Harris, Zachary Fisher and Tammy Hilliker dba Clerk and Deputy Clerks of Court, respectively (to name a few). (See Code of Conduct, Canon 3(B) infra.) Here, Mitchell believes probable cause exists for application of the theory of vicarious liability aka "respondeat superior" in Latin (let superiors answer for the misconduct of their subordinates).

All three of the latter personnel of this Court have either failed or refused to produce their APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS required by 5 USC 3331 et seq., and their OATH OF OFFICE required by 28 USC 951 (duties), after receiving Mitchell's proper DEMANDs for disclosure of same.

TRULINCS 44202086 - MODELESKI, MITCHELL PAUL - Unit: SPG-G-P

In this context, after finding it Mitchell has been relying upon a statement in 63C AmJur 2d, to wit: "The public have a right to demand that public officials perform all of their duties faithfully."

Also, by studying the FOIA, Mitchell confirmed the Federal law at 5 USC 551(1)(B) presently exempts the entire Judicial Branch from the Freedom of Information Act, thus necessitating a DEMAND instead of a proper FOIA Request for disclosure of credentials required of this Court's inferior officers i.e. magistrates, clerks and deputy clerks.

Mitchell has now formally charged Stephan Harris with concealing Court records in violation of 18 USC 1519 (a Federal felony). (See the Court Docket for that "VCC" infra, and in pari materia compare 18 USC 2071 where it mentions "custody" of court records.)

The Court is the legal custodian of all APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS of all Court officers, designated as such by the Federal law at 5 USC 2906 ("the court to which the office pertains"), NOT the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts in Washington, D.C.

Mitchell sincerely believes the instant case can and should be correctly and promptly dismissed as a direct consequence of the well documented failure by Stephan Harris to produce 2 required credentials; without both credentials, neither he nor any of his subordinates can lawfully sign, or seal, any "subpoenas" issued by the Court. See 28 USCS 1691 and 28 USCA 1691 for extensive case law upon which Mitchell has often relied during the period in question.

Mitchell concluded that delegation of authority by Stephan Harris is legally impossible, as long as he cannot or will not produce proof of all credentials required of all Clerks of Court and all Deputy Clerks of Court by applicable Federal statutes and Constitutional provisions. (See 6:3, U.S. Const.)

Mitchell has also concluded that the Paperwork Reduction Act effectively created a "right to inspect" all U.S. Office of Personnel Management Standard Form 61 APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS for the required display of a valid OMB control number at the upper right-hand corner of page one.

Mitchell therefore believes the net effects of all these missing and defective credentials is a clear and painfully obvious violation of FRCP Rule 2, at a minimum, in addition to many far-reaching violations of criminal statutes dutifully cited in Mitchell's several VERIFIED CRIMINAL COMPLAINTs, ON INFORMATION ("VCC"), as now filed in the Court's official Docket records in the instant case.

For the record, Rule 2 currently reads: "Interpretation. These rules are to be interpreted to provide for the just determination of every criminal proceeding, to secure simplicity in procedure and fairness in administration, and to eliminate unjustifiable expense and delay. (As amended April 29, 2002, eff. Dec. 1, 2002.)"

On information found in the Federal court decision in U.S. v. Gregory, 508 F.Supp. 1218 (USDC/SDAL 1980), Mitchell also relies now upon the following abstract of that decision, to wit: "Pursuant to Rule 2, party who objects to Court's ruling on motion to recuse should be able to obtain review of that ruling before being put to burden and expense of lengthy trial."

TRULINCS 44202086 - MODELESKI, MITCHELL PAUL - Unit: SPG-G-P

To date, Mitchell has also lodged four (4) separate "Qui Tam" Complaints under the False Claims Act ("FCA") at 31 USC 3729 et seq. Each contained a PROOF OF SERVICE identifying recipients of hard copy originals transmitted by Mitchell via U.S. Mail.

Mitchell has also studied case law under the FCA which properly classifies qui tam relators as "agents of the United States" (see United States ex rel. Madden v. General Dynamics Corp., 4 F.3d 827 (9th Cir. 1993)).

As such, Mitchell believes that he is thereby entitled to all authorized awards and all protections afforded to all FCA "whistleblowers" (see 31 USC 3730(h), expressly authorizing relief from retaliation against "agents" for efforts to stop false claims against the Treasury of the United States.)

Mitchell also relies consistently upon the statute at 5 USC 5507 (a Federal officer cannot get paid before executing a valid 5 USC 3332 affidavit).

[continue at 2 of 2]

TRULINCS 44202086 - MODELESKI, MITCHELL PAUL - Unit: SPG-G-P

FROM: 44202086
TO: Brown, Thomas; Saccato, Larry
SUBJECT: APPLICATION FOR DISQUALIFICATIONS [2 of 2]
DATE: 10/03/2014 10:20:51 AM

[continued from 1 of 2]

On further information and belief, Mitchell has studied the Code of Conduct for United States Judges, and thereby inferred probable and demonstrable violations of Canons 2(A), 3(A)(4), 3(B)(1) and 3(B)(2) from all facts, laws and court decisions mentioned heretofore.

On information found in the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of U.S. v. Mason, 412 U.S. 391 (1973), Mitchell also relies upon the following text in that decision, to wit: "If the doctrine of stare decisis has any meaning at all, it requires that people in their everyday affairs be able to rely upon our [U.S. Supreme Court] decisions and not be needlessly penalized for such reliance."

On information found in the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966), Mitchell also relies upon the following principle established in that historic decision, to wit: "Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them."

On all information discussed heretofore, Mitchell sincerely believes that sufficient probable cause already exists to justify the conclusion that Freudenthal lacks even minimal authority to determine the legal sufficiency of this AFFIDAVIT under 28 USC 144.

PAM

This concludes Mitchell's AFFIDAVIT OF BIAS AND PREJUDICE.

INCORPORATION OF ATTACHMENTS

Mitchell hereby incorporates by reference two Attachments: "NOTICE TO COUNSELS: USA v. Hill et al. (dated 9/20/2014)" and "NOTICE OF ERRORS by Harris & Harris, P.C. (dated 10/1/2014)" as if both were set forth fully here.

VERIFICATION / CERTIFICATE OF GOOD FAITH

I, Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S., Sui Juris, hereby verify under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the United States of America, without the "United States" (Federal government), that the instant APPLICATION is made in good faith, and 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, pursuant to 28 USC 1746(1). See Supremacy Clause (Constitution, Laws and Treaties of the United States are all the supreme Law of the Land).

Dated: 10/1/2014

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Paul Andrew Mitchell

Paul Mitchell

- 6 of 13 -

Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S. (chosen name)*

TRULINCS 44202086 - MODELESKI, MITCHELL PAUL - Unit: SPG-G-P

Private Attorney General, Civil RICO: 18 USC 1964,
Rotella v. Wood, 528 U.S. 549 (2000)
(objectives of Civil RICO);
Agent of the United States as Qui Tam Relator,
False Claims Act: 31 USC 3729 et seq. (4X)

* See Doe v. Dunning, 549 P.2d 1
(Washington State Supreme Court)

All Rights Reserved (cf. UCC 1-308)

Attachments: NOTICE TO COUNSELS: USA v. Hill et al. (dated 9/20/2014)
NOTICE OF ERRORS by Harris & Harris, P.C. (dated 10/1/2014)

TRULINCS 44202086 - MODELESKI, MITCHELL PAUL - Unit: SPG-G-P

FROM: 44202086

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

SUBJECT: Notice to Counsels: USA v. Hill et al.

DATE: 09/20/2014 12:08:56 PM

Greetings Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am writing to you for the primary purpose of making each of you aware of certain laws and facts which may not, and probably won't, come to your attention by any other means.

As you may already know, I have continued to reserve all Rights (cf. UCC 1-308), with emphasis on all of my Fundamental Rights, and to appear In Propria Persona i.e. "personally" under 28 USC 1654. Cf. "In Propria Persona" in Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, particularly where that definition addresses the issue of Court jurisdiction.

I have now survived two (2) Faretta hearings -- one in Seattle and one in Cheyenne. The hearing on 3/21/2014 in Cheyenne was noteworthy for repeated attempts by one Nancy Dell Freudenthal ("NDF") to change my mind about formal legal representation: I reserved my right to change my mind, and I continued to proceed In Propria Persona.

The other noteworthy event at that 3/21/2014 hearing was NDF's obvious attempt to characterize the credential investigation as some kind of "pathological obsession". A transcript should show that I opposed her vain attempt, and I actually succeeded in eliciting a spoken apology from NDF.

For reasons like the latter, I have properly demanded her immediate recusal, but she stubbornly refuses to do so.

The case law I have studied requires recusal even if there is the mere appearance of bias. I believe that your several clients are, therefore, now at serious risk of continuing bias and prejudice by NDF, and by her several accomplices, in our case(s) -- chiefly Stephan Harris and L. Robert Murray.

More to the merits of our Fundamental Rights, DOJ's Office of Information Policy ("OIP") promptly replied to my proper FOIA Request while I was being detained unlawfully in Gering, Nebraska. OIP's timely reply contained a cover letter, and responsive documents, calling for the following logical conclusions of law:

(1) no SENATE CONFIRMATION required of NDF by 5 USC 2902(c), and by either 2:2:2 or 2:2:3 in the

- 8 of 13 -

TRULINCS 44202086 - MODELESKI, MITCHELL PAUL - Unit: SPG-G-P

U.S. Constitution (Article:Section:Clause);

(2) incomplete PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION also required of NDF by 5 USC 2902(c), and by either 2:2:2 or 2:2:3, due in part to defective U.S. OPM Standard Form 61 ("SF-61") APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS for one Eric Holder, Jr.; see also 44 USC 3512 here;

(3) NDF's SF-61 is also a counterfeit form because:

(a) it lacks a valid OMB control number at the upper right-hand corner, as required by 44 USC 3501 et seq.; (cf. OMB control number 50-R0118 i.e. five zero dash R zero one one eight);

(b) it lacks the paragraph citing 5 USC 2903 (Authority to administer); and,

(c) the electronic SF-61 published at www.opm.gov was not reviewed or approved by OMB as required by 5 CFR 1320.5, the Federal Regulation implementing the Paperwork Reduction Act ("PRA"): again, see 44 USC 3512;

Under the Appointments Clause at 2:2:2, a SENATE CONFIRMATION must precede the other 3 credentials required of all U.S. District Judges.

Under the Recess Appointments Clause at 2:2:3, a SENATE CONFIRMATION must issue during the next ensuing Senate session i.e. after those other 3 credentials.

Accordingly, I have recently requested the law firm of Harris & Harris, P.C., to confirm the exact dates of NDF's alleged appointment, and of the vacancy she claimed to fill. To date, Harris & Harris, P.C., have not disclosed those exact dates to me.

Nevertheless, it is not likely that she was initially appointed at "Chief Judge"; and, enough time has now elapsed to compel a conclusion that NDF surely needed a SENATE CONFIRMATION under one or the other option: 2:2:2 or 2:2:3. See also the definition of "officer" at 5 USC 2104, 3332 and 5507. *PJM*

The legal (and moral) consequences of NDF's missing and defective credentials are quite far-reaching e.g. by necessarily rendering null and void:

(a) all her "orders" and "rulings" to date;

(b) all hearings on which she attempted to preside; and,

(c) the original "arrest warrant" executed upon my Person on 1/28/2014.

As such, the USDC/DWY lacked jurisdiction in personam (over my proper Person) ab initio (at least beginning 1/28/2014).

TRULINCS 44202086 - MODELESKI, MITCHELL PAUL - Unit: SPG-G-P

Moreover, NDF's attempt to appoint Mr. Terry J. Harris as my formal legal representative was also void ab initio, for the very same reasons.

At another hearing on 7/10/2014, I again appeared under protest and In Propria Persona; and, I gave at least 2 hours of testimony under direct examination by Terry J. Harris -- chiefly because no one else was qualified, or prepared, to conduct such a direct examination of me.

You should also be informed, via filed Docket records, that several other Federal personnel have also failed or refused to disclose their mandatory credentials e.g. see RELATOR'S FIFTH VERIFIED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT, ON INFORMATION ("VCC"), and all other VCCs previously filed in the Docket records, in timely compliance with 18 USC 4 (misprision of felony).

Notably, Dr. Cynthia A. Low has now failed or refused to answer my proper FOIA Request for her own SF-61. My first attempt to address that Request to the "Disclosure Officer" at FDC/SeaTac was returned by the U.S. Postal Service with the annotation "no such addressee" (or words to that effect).

For that reason, I promptly re-mailed that FOIA Request directly to Dr. Low, but no reply has been forthcoming from her, nor from any of her superiors nor anyone else at FDC/SeaTac.

I also wish to take this opportunity to make you aware that I have now authored approximately 30 CONFIDENTIAL Journal entries consisting of 50+ pages; and, I mailed all of those Journal entries to Harris & Harris, P.C.

Please accept this communication as my formal authorization for all defense counsel to obtain photocopies of all such handwritten Journal entries.

I wrote those Journal entries also to focus the attention of each defense Counsel on the key issues (e.g. the heart of the matter), and to prevent invasions of my privacy Rights that would otherwise result from what are often described as "fishing expeditions" -- assembling enormous quantities of questionable and irrelevant data, at great and unnecessary expense to government treasuries (e.g. 20,000 pages and still counting).

Kindly allow me briefly to demonstrate to you why it is not appropriate or necessary to label my case as "complex": Stephan Harris has refused to produce any valid credentials, in blatant violation of 18 USC 1519 (a felony). Therefore, he could not have signed or sealed any subpoena(s) issued by any Federal grand jury(s); he could not have selected or summoned any Federal grand jury(s); and,

TRULINCS 44202086 - MODELESKI, MITCHELL PAUL - Unit: SPG-G-P

he could not have delegated any authority(s) to any subordinate deputy clerk(s) whatsoever.


See my essay "Clerks or Jerks? The Pivotal Duties of Federal Court Clerks" for further pertinent details.

In my professional opinion, any and all efforts to expand the scope of my case beyond those simple issues is a direct and blatant violation of FRCrP Rule 2; and, those efforts also constitute probable cause that barratry has already occurred, and continues to occur even as I write this.

(Barratry is an offense similar to "churning" by a stock broker i.e. for purposes of maximizing fee generation; "Esquire" is an office under the Crown of England. Cf. Bouvier's Law Dictionary (1856).)

If any of you need further clarification of any points made above, please consult the relevant Docket entries first, then reply via email to my trusted legal assistant <lsaccato@gmail.com> who will forward your terse reply(s) to me at his earliest convenience (no email attachments, please).

Thank you for your professional consideration.

Sincerely yours, 
/s/ Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S. (chosen name)
Private Attorney General, Civil RICO: 18 USC 1964,
Rotella v. Wood, 528 U.S. 549 (2000)
(objectives of Civil RICO);
Agent of the United States as Qui Tam Relator,
False Claims Act: 31 USC 3729 et seq. (4X)

All Rights Reserved (cf. UCC 1-308)

Copies forwarded to:

<agharkarmd@gmail.com>
<tom@jubinzerga.com>
<mike@mhrwylaw.com>
<tjharrispc@gmail.com>
<emily.marie.harris@gmail.com>

Gay Woodhouse
1912 Capitol Avenue, Suite 500
Cheyenne 82001
Wyoming, USA

Thomas A. Fleener
Fleener & Vang, LCC
P.O. Box 1186
Laramie 82073
Wyoming, USA

- 11 of 13 -

TRULINCS 44202086 - MODELESKI, MITCHELL PAUL - Unit: SPG-G-P

FROM: 44202086

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

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF ERRORS by Harris & Harris, P.C.

DATE: 10/01/2014 04:54:51 PM

TO:

Hon. Warden

USMCFP

P.O. Box 4000

Springfield 65801-4000

Missouri, USA

RE: August 6, 2014 letter from Terry J. Harris

Greetings Hon. Warden:

Please allow me to explain to you, and to all your subordinates who may have a need to know, several serious errors that are evident in the written correspondence you recently received from Harris & Harris, P.C., Cheyenne, Wyoming.

On the first page of his cover letter to you dated August 6, 2014, Mr. Terry J. Harris makes the following serious errors in the first paragraph:

- * "I represent Paul Mitchell" [NOT correct]
- * "Nancy Freudenthal's Order appointing me" [NOT correct]
- * "her more recent Order declaring Paul Mitchell incompetent" [NOT correct]

As admitted in their written reply to my proper Request under the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"), DOJ's Office of Information Policy ("OIP") did not find any SENATE CONFIRMATION in their appointment file for Nancy Dell Freudenthal.

Moreover, her U.S. Office of Personnel Management ("OPM") Standard Form 61 APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS ("SF-61") are a counterfeit form because:

- (a) no OMB control number is displayed at the upper right-hand corner;
- (b) there is no paragraph citing 5 USC 2903 (Authority to administer); and,
- (c) the electronic form at www.opm.gov was never reviewed or approved by the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB").

Also, Freudenthal's PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION is incomplete because of the counterfeit SF-61 executed by one Eric Holder, Jr. Here, see 5 USC 2902(c), which mandates the Attorney General's signature on all such PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSIONS.

OIP's cover letter and responsive documents were mailed by me to the P.O. Box of Harris & Harris, P.C. in Cheyenne, Wyoming, while I was unlawfully detained at a county jail in Gering, Nebraska.

I also requested OIP to forward to that P.O. Box OIP's timely reply to my proper FOIA Appeal.

-12 of 13-

TRULINCS 44202086 - MODELESKI, MITCHELL PAUL - Unit: SPG-G-P

Freudenthal's missing -and- defective credentials do violate at least two Clauses in the U.S. Constitution (cf. 6:3, and either 2:2:2 or 2:2:3), and a distinct group of other Federal laws which implement those Clauses.

As such, Ms. Freudenthal lacked the required authority to appoint Mr. Harris legally to represent me; and, she lacked the required authority to issue any order(s) whatsoever, least of all one that blatantly defames me for being "incompetent" [sic]. Defamation is criminal.

Contrary to appearances (and pretenses) fostered by Mr. Harris et al., he does not and cannot legally "represent" me as long as I continue to proceed In Propria Persona. I have always appeared In Propria Persona i.e. "personally", which is my right under 28 USC 1654.

I have now survived two (2) Faretta hearings, which can be confirmed by consulting the Court records in Docket #2:14-CR-00027-NDF-2 (USDC/Cheyenne).

If you still harbor any reasons why you may doubt or question what I have written above, please feel free to "go to the source" and contact OIP directly. That Office is also part of the same Department ("DOJ") of which you are presently an officer.


See 5 USC 3331, 3332, 3333, and 5507.

The real reason why I am presently incarcerated at USMCFP/Springfield is our credential investigation.

If you wish to receive more information about that investigation, I will be happy to answer your questions as promptly as humanly possible, given the limited resources and severe restrictions which I am now compelled to endure in violation of the Constitution, laws and treaties of the United States.

Here, see the Supremacy Clause in the U.S. Constitution and also the Act of Congress at 28 USC 2241(c)(3) in chief.

Thank you, Warden, for your continuing professional consideration.

Sincerely yours, 
/s/ Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S. (chosen name)*
Private Attorney General, Civil RICO: 18 USC 1964,
Rotella v. Wood, 528 U.S. 549 (2000)
(objectives of Civil RICO);
Agent of the United States as Qui Tam Relator,
False Claims Act: 31 USC 3729 et seq. (4X)

* See Doe v. Dunning, 549 P.2d 1 (Washington State Supreme Court)
(fundamental principle and common-law right to change one's name)

All Rights Reserved (cf. UCC 1-308)

Model



USMCFP # 44202-086
Medical Center for Federal Prisoners
P.O. Box 4000
Springfield 65801-4000
Missouri, USA

LEGAL MAIL

Springfield PDPC NO 6301
TUE 07 OCT 2014 PM



"Special Mail"

TO: Office of Clerk of Court
U.S. District Court

Re:
2:14-cr-00027-NDF

2120 Capital Ave, 2nd Floor
Cheyenne 82001
Wyoming, USA
82001

All Rights Reserved
(cf. Dec 1-308)

U.S. Medical Center for Federal Prisoners
P.O. Box 4000
Springfield, MO 65801

OCT 07 2014

The enclosed letter was processed through special mailing procedures for forwarding to you. The letter has been neither opened nor inspected. If the writer raises a jurisdiction, you may wish to return the material for further information or clarification. If the writer encloses correspondence for forwarding to another address, please return the enclosure to the above address.