



Paul Andrew Mitchell <supremelawfirm@gmail.com>

---

**Request for Quotation: electronic copy of CERTIFICATE OF ADMISSION and CERTIFICATE OF OATH for Agustin Hernandez, SBN #161625**

---

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

Thu, Feb 2, 2017 at 3:45 PM

To: MSC <MSC@calbar.ca.gov>

Cc: Agustin.Hernandez@calbar.ca.gov

Bcc:

*Re:*

<http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/Member/Detail/161625>

Greetings Member Records:

Please reply with a firm Quotation of all costs and steps required of me to obtain a true and correct copy of the CERTIFICATE OF ADMISSION (aka "license") and CERTIFICATE OF OATH duly indorsed on (the back of) said "license" by Agustin Hernandez, SBN #161625.

I believe your office has already received extensive documentation concerning Sections 6064, 6067 and 6068 in the California Business and Professions Code, chiefly and in particular the "member" is the legal custodian of that credential, designated as such by CBPC Section 6064 and by all predecessor statutes.

I also strongly suspect, based on 27 YEARS of research now, that personnel employed by *The State Bar of California*, particularly those personnel also claiming to be "members" in good standing, are mostly, if not totally, ignorant of the intent of Congress when it enacted the Civil RICO statute at 18 U.S.C. 1964. We routinely share the standing decision in Rotella v. Wood, for its clear explanation

of the "**objectives of Civil RICO**"; repeating, for the edification of all such personnel:

<http://supremelaw.org/decs/agency/private.attorney.general.htm>

<http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-supreme-court/528/549.html>

In rejecting a significantly different focus under RICO, therefore, we are honoring an analogy that Congress itself accepted and relied upon, and one that promotes the objectives of civil RICO as readily as it furthers the objects of the Clayton Act. Both statutes share a common congressional objective of encouraging civil litigation to supplement Government efforts to deter and penalize the respectively prohibited practices. **The object of civil RICO is thus not merely to compensate victims but to turn them into prosecutors, "private attorneys general," dedicated to eliminating racketeering activity.** <sup>3</sup> *Id.*, at 187 (citing *Malley-Duff*, 483 U.S., at 151 ) (civil RICO specifically has a "further purpose [of] encouraging potential private plaintiffs diligently to investigate"). The provision for treble damages is accordingly justified by the expected benefit of suppressing racketeering activity, an object pursued the sooner the better.

[*Rotella v. Wood et al.*, 528 U.S. 549 (2000)]

[**bold** and underline emphases added]

## **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION**

**We now politely request your written acknowledgment that private attorneys general are NOT required to be licensed attorneys, although a licensed attorney may also be a private attorney general.**

Thank you very much for your assistance -and- **written acknowledgment**, in this matter.

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>)

## Attachments:

proper SUBPOENA IN A CIVIL CASE (IN DEFAULT)  
and Domestic Return Receipt, PS Form 3811 (as proof of  
delivery)

3 attachments

District Court of the United States  
District of Columbia  
Paul Andrew Mitchell  
1149 S. Hill St.  
Los Angeles 90015  
CALIFORNIA USA

subpoena.statebar.1.gif  
144K

Board of Governors  
% CEO  
State Bar of Calif.  
1149 S. Hill St.  
Los Angeles 90015  
CALIFORNIA USA

subpoena.statebar.4.gif  
403K

delivery.instructions.doc  
22K