No.

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

In Re: David Schied,
Petitioner

This Extraordinary Writ is in Accompaniment of two petitions for Writ of Certiorari Currently on Appeal from The United States Court of District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan
and the
United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit
Cited as
Application No. 10A1017
And
Application No. 10A1018

APPENDIX FOR
PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

David Schied
Pro Se
PO Box 1378
Novi, Michigan 48376
248-946-4016

Appendix A – These are the Opinions and Orders precipitating the need for the two other Petitions for Certiorari referenced as Application No. 10A1017 and Application No. 10A1018 provided as follows:

A1 – *Schied v. Ronald Ward, et. al* (1/14/2011)– This ruling by the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, dated 1/14/11, is in regard to the lower courts' rulings of the case now presented to the U.S. Supreme Court referenced as Application #10A1017. This is the "*unpublished*" Order of judges Danny Boggs, Ronald Gilman, and Joseph Hood of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, written in response to Petitioner having filed an 87-page brief on appeal, after having also filed a two and a half inch (2 ½") thick packet of evidence with his 90-page complaint in the U.S. District Court. This ruling upholds the U.S. District Court's ruling to dismiss Petitioner's complaint against the administrators and employees of a THIRD school district. This dismissal is purportedly based upon the government Defendants' argument that Petitioner's allegations are "*vague*" and that Petitioner has "*failed to state a claim...to relief that is plausible*". One problem with this ruling is the fact that two of these three Sixth Circuit Court judges (Boggs and Gilman) failed to mention anything in that judgment Order about the Petitioner having "*judicial misconduct*" complaints pending against each of these two federal judges long prior to their taking seats on a "*panel of the court*" in review of this case.

A2 – *Schied v. Ronald Ward, et. al* (12/22/2009) – This ruling by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, dated 12/22/09, is in regard to the case now presented to the U.S. Supreme Court referenced as Application #10A1017. The evidence of Duggan's ruling demonstrates that rather than to address any significant number of the specific allegations, laws, or evidence provided by Petitioner David Schied, Judge Duggan instead relied upon the "*fraudulent*" pleadings alone generated by the other criminal co-defendants named in this instant case. Moreover, Judge Duggan "*omitted*" ANY reference to Mr. Schied's itemized 196 documents of separately filed Evidence. He also disregarded Mr. Schied's numerous references to the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989, 5 U.S.C. § 702, §1214, §1215, §1216 and 5 U.S.C. § 2302(8)(b), and to 20 U.S.C. Chapter 33 §1400I(6), §1400(d)(3-4), §1403, §1407(b), §1408(b), §1411(e)(B) and (f)(3), §1412, §1413, §1416, §1418, and §1450, under the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act (IDEA). Instead, he chose to cite the judgments by other Federal judges, while knowing all the while that those cases revolved around Petitioner's filing of other reports and Evidence of corruption in the Michigan circuit courts, in the Michigan Court of Appeals, and in the Michigan Supreme Court. Duggan's reference to the other "*Schied*" federal cases shows that he knew that Petitioner had named a plethora of other State and Federal court judges as criminal co-defendants because of their own "*pattern of omissions and misstatements*" when issuing those previous rulings that judges Zatkoff, Daughtrey, Tatenhove, and McKeague had previously cited, as Judge Duggan did, to justify their own "*judicial*

misconduct" and the judicial misconduct of others in their "*peer group*" of government officials.

A3 – *Schied v. Scott Snyder, et. al* (1/19/2011) – This ruling by the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, dated 1/19/11, is in regard to the lower courts' rulings of the case now presented to the U.S. Supreme Court referenced as Application #10A1018. This is the "*unpublished*" Order of judges Damon Keith, Eric Clay, and Raymond Kethledge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, written in response to Petitioner having filed a 63-page brief on appeal on behalf of his dependent child "*Student A*". This Appeal followed Petitioner having also filed a three and a half inch (3 ½") thick packet of eight-eight (88) factual exhibits, which was filed along with Petitioner's 223-page Complaint in the U.S. District Court. The Appeal was dismissed despite Petitioner having properly filed "*Responses*" to Respondents' numerous motions to dismiss and without the Respondents ever addressing any of those factual allegations and supporting evidence. The ruling of dismissal somehow reasoned that despite all the evidence "*the complaint's factual allegations are insufficient to plausibly support the legal conclusions asserted by Schied*".

A4 – *Schied v. Scott Snyder, et. al* (1/22/2010) – This ruling by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, dated 1/22/10, is in regard to the case now presented to the U.S. Supreme Court referenced as Application #10A1018. The evidence of O'Meara's ruling demonstrates that rather than to address any significant number of the specific allegations, laws, or evidence provided by Petitioner David Schied, Judge O'Meara disseminated misinformation to the public as constructed into his "*official*" court ruling with the "*Background Facts*". There is an extensive list of the statements made by this ruling of Judge O'Meara "*misrepresenting*" the actual background of this case and causing additional harm against Petitioner, as well as his dependent young child "*Student A*", by compounding the defamation perpetrated by the Respondents and depriving Petitioner of certain constitutional rights. Though too lengthy to detail herein, a copy of the "*judicial misconduct complaint*" that was filed against Judge O'Meara is also provided in "Appendix #1A" of the "*Petition for Certiorari*" of Application #10A1018.

STATE COURTS:

Other Judgment Orders to review on the merits, many which follow lineages of cases to the highest State court, appear at Appendix B to the Petition and are listed as follows:

B1 – *State of Texas vs. No. 266491 Schied: David, Eugene* (12/20/1979) – This is an "*Early Termination Order of the Court Dismissing the Cause*", "*State of Texas v. David Eugene Schied*". 183rd District Court of Harris County, Texas. Case No. 266491. Issued 12/20/1979. The discretionary Order of the trial

court provides a "*withdrawal of plea*", "*dismissal of indictment*", and "*set aside of judgment*".

B2 – By Proclamation of the Governor of the State of Texas (6/1/1983) – This document is an official "*Full Pardon and Restoration of Full Civil Rights of Citizenship*", Governor for the State of Texas. Proc. No. 83-10486; Issued 6/1/1983.

B3 – *Ex Parte David Eugene Schied* (10/1/2004) – This is an "*Agreed Order of Expunction*", Ex Parte David Eugene Schied; 234th District Court of Harris County, Texas. Case No. 2004-28810. Issued 10/1/2004.

B4 – "*Rudy Valentino Cuellar v. State of Texas*"; ***70 SW3d 815 (Tex Crim App 2002)*** – This judgment reasons that a "discretionary-type" of set aside under Art. 42.12 §20 means that the "*conviction is wiped away*" and the subject is "*free of all penalties and disabilities*" resulting from the previous conviction.

B5 – "*Opinion DM-349*", Office of the Attorney General Dan Morales for the State of Texas. Issued 5/31/1995. – This Opinion reasons that anyone in receipt of a "*set aside*" in ineligible for a "*pardon*" for "*lack of an object to pardon*".

B6 – "*Order Granting Defendants' Motion to Compel Discovery*", Circuit Court for the County of Washtenaw, Michigan. "*David Schied v. Sandra Harris and the Lincoln Consolidated School District Board of Education*" Case No. 4-000577-CL. Issued 12/10/04 – This was an unconstitutional Order compelling Petitioner to go back into deposition, and despite his having a Texas court "*Order of Expunction*" obliterating all past records related to even the "*arrest*" record for a 1977 offense, ordering Petitioner to begin generating a new record incriminating himself by having admit that he had pled guilty in 1977 in order to explain why that plea had been "*withdrawn*" in 1979 and admitting that he had been "*convicted*" in order to explain for what reason he believed he had received a governor's full pardon for such a "*conviction*".

B7 – "*Order Granting Defendants' Motion for Summary Disposition*", Circuit Court for the County of Washtenaw, Michigan. "*David Schied v. Sandra Harris and the Lincoln Consolidated School District Board of Education*" Case No. 4-000577-CL. Issued 11/10/2005 – This Order is accompanied by 37-pages of typed transcript from the motion hearing dated 10/26/05 as referenced by the Order. This order reveals the extent to which Michigan Circuit Court judge Melinda Morris disregarded Petitioner's right to challenge and correct an erroneous FBI report and disregarded her own instincts telling her that an individual who had received a "set aside" (with a "withdrawal of plea and dismissal of indictment" following and early termination of "probation" would not even be eligible for a pardon "for lack of an object to pardon") to provide favor to the government attorney's fraudulent that the "expungement"

document from Texas pertained to a "conviction" and that neither a set aside nor a pardon is sufficient enough to erase a so-called conviction that was supposed to have remained on Petitioner's record (as the FBI report showed as the "disposition" along with a status of "probation") a quarter century after Petitioner had received both a set aside and a pardon.

B8 – Final judgment ruling (unpublished) "*David Schied v. Sandra Harris and the Lincoln Consolidated School District Board of Education*", 2006 WL 1789035 (Mich Ct App No. 267023). Issued June 29, 2006. – This document shows the extent to which the Michigan Court of Appeals was willing to twist their interpretation of the law and to "cherry-pick" which facts to litigate so as to uphold the lower court ruling and to determine in an "unpublished" ruling (knowing that it would published to the world through the internet) that Petitioner had misrepresented his "conviction" and that a government official was entitled to write defamatory letters calling Petitioner a liar and a convict a quarter-century after receiving a set aside and a pardon and moving on with his life; and while refusing to litigate the significance of the Texas expunction document or Texas expungement laws showing that both only related to the "remaining records pertaining to the ARREST", which is all that should have been left to be reflected on the 2003 FBI report and thus proving the FBI report was erroneous to begin with.

B9 – "*Order of Denial of Leave to Appeal to the Michigan Supreme Court*", Michigan Supreme Court, SC: 131803; COA: 267023; Washtenaw CC: 4-000577-CL. "*David Schied v. Sandra Harris and the Lincoln Consolidated School District Board of Education*" Issued 11/29/06. – This set of exhibits also includes two other items of: a) Letter of Petitioner's attorney to the Michigan Education Association stating his reasons for requesting this case be appealed to the Michigan Supreme Court; and, b) Petitioner's "*Reply to Appellees' Brief in Opposition to Plaintiff-Appellant's Application for Leave to Appeal*" subsequently filed by that attorney as his argument to the Michigan Supreme Court pointing out genuine issues of fact blatantly ignored by the Michigan Court of Appeals.

B10 – "*Order Granting Defendant's Motion for Summary Disposition*", Circuit Court for the County of Wayne, Michigan. Case No. 06-633604-NO. "*Schied v. Northville Public School District*". Issued 4/19/07. – This Order is accompanied by 17-pages of typed transcripts from the motion hearing dated 3/30/07 as referenced by the Order, ruling that "*Expungements are a myth*" and "*Michigan legislators meant for schoolteachers to be subject to a "life sentence*".

B11 – "*Order of Dismissal*", Circuit Court for the County of Ingham, Michigan. Case No. 07-1256-AW. "*Schied v. State of Michigan, et al.*" Issued 12/07/07. – This

set of exhibits includes the oral hearing transcript in which this judge refused to "*hear*" criminal allegations in his civil courtroom (and after revealing from the bench off the record that he was "*lifelong friends*" with one of the criminal co-defendants named in the case. These exhibits also include that court's "*Docket Sheet*", and the first pages of Petitioner's "*More Definite Statement*" proving that this Michigan "*chief*" judge committed "*fraud upon the court*" when also dismissing the case without hearing on numerous motions Petitioner had paid for to have heard, with one of those motions being a "*Motion for Judge to Disqualify Himself for Judicial Misconduct*" in a case of "*criminal racketeering and corruption*".

B12 – Judgment ruling (published) "*Eric C. Frohriep and All Others Similarly Situated v. Michael P. Flanagan, Jeremy M. Hughes, and Frank P. Ciloski*", Michigan Court of Appeals, Case No. 273426, Ingham Circuit Court No. 06-000430-NZ. Issued 5/10/07. – This document shows that at the time Petitioner was going through his case there were other schoolteachers who were screaming "*foul*" when having their names added to a "*list*" of criminal offenders and with that list disseminated to all school districts in Michigan without first confirming the accuracy of the criminal history information being provided to the Michigan Department of Education by the Michigan State Police as was done in Petitioner's case.

B13 – "*Order of Denials*", Michigan Court of Appeals, "*Schied v. State of Michigan, et al.*" COA Case No. 282804; Ingham County Circuit Court No. 07-001256-AW. Issued 5/11/09. – This Order was in denial of three motions filed by Petitioner listed as follows and included in their entirety by attachment:

- "*Motion to Demand This Court Read All Pleadings Plaintiff Files with This Court, and to Adhere Only to Constitutionally Compliant Law and Case Law, and More Particularly, the Bill of Rights, in its Rulings.*"
- "*Motion to Claim and Exercise Constitutional Rights, and Require the Presiding Judges to Rule Upon This Motion For Superintending Control and a Finding of Contempt Against Defendants*"
- "*Motion to Hear Three Motions Plaintiff-Appellant Properly Filed in Lower Court Yet Still Without Any Hearing*".

B14 – Michigan Court of Appeals' *unpublished* "*Memorandum*"; Michigan Court of Appeals, COA Case No. 282804; Ingham County Circuit Court No. 07-001256-AW. "*Schied v. State of Michigan, et al.*" Issued 5/19/09. – This Order was in accompaniment of an Order of Dismissal of the Ingham County case on Appeal. The ruling asserted that "because plaintiff did not file an affidavit below in support of his motion (for Judge Collette to "*Disqualify Himself for Judicial Misconduct*") the motion was "not properly before" the Court of

Appeals. This Court did not provided "*pro se*" and "*forma pauperis*" any opportunity however to "*correct*" the deficiencies of his filing however. They added that Judge William Collette's lifetime friendship with the Defendant that Petitioner had named as participating in crimes of cover up and criminal corruption "*did not alone demonstrate a probability of bias that would have required disqualification*". Also in gross disregard of Plaintiff's 404-page Complaint and 177 Exhibits, this Court of Appeals ruled summarily – without supporting reason and evidence – that "*Plaintiff's Complaint and subsequent 'more definite statement' contained many broad and diffuse allegations that were not properly before the circuit court and 'not discernibly supported by a reasoned application of law and fact*". The Court of Appeals also ignored the extensive Table of Contents partitioning the claims of the Complaint while fraudulently publishing their claim that "*plaintiff's complaint did not provide notice to the adverse parties of the claims they were to defend*".

B15 – "***Order of Denial of Leave to Appeal to the Michigan Supreme Court***", Michigan Supreme Court, SC: 139162; COA: 282804; Ingham County Circuit Court: 4-000577-CL. Issued 11/29/06. This Order is accompanied by a letter written on 7/20/09 by Petitioner in protest to the Supreme Court Clerk Corbin Davis in notification that the Supreme Court was fraudulently misfiling Petitioner's NEW complaint, a "*Quo-Warranto / State Ex-Rel*" complaint, with DIFFERENT complainants and DIFFERENT co-Respondents, improperly as "*the same*" case previously dismissed from the lower Court of Appeals.

B16 – By "*Order of a Higher Power*": The "Resignation Letter of Michigan Supreme Court Justice Elizabeth Weaver", dated 8/26/10. This letter was written in statement that the Michigan Supreme Court is corrupted and no longer follows any "*rule of law*". Judge Weaver wrote that this written "*decision*" was reached through contemplation and prayer.

FEDERAL COURTS:

The Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals and the Sixth Circuit appears at Appendix B to the Petition and are listed as follows:

B17 – "***Opinion and Order (1) Granting Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment; and (2) Holding in Abeyance Defendants' Motion for Sanctions***", U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division. Case No. 08-CV-10005; Judge Paul D. Borman. "***Schied v. Thomas Davis, Jr. et al.***" Issued 5/30/08. This set of documents includes a copy of the Cover Page of the 42 U.S.C. §1983 Complaint, "*David Schied v. Thomas Davis, Jr.*

(director of Texas Dept. of Public Safety), Jennifer Granholm (Michigan Governor), Leonard Rezmierski (superintendent of Northville Public Schools), Sandra Harris (former superintendent of Lincoln Consolidated Schools), and Fred Williams (superintendent of Lincoln Consolidated Schools)"). This ruling of dismissal was by false claim of the judge that the significant issues of the two school district cases (i.e., the civil and CRIMINAL aspects of the Lincoln and Northville) had already been litigated when they clearly had not.

B18 – "*Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion to Expand/Enlarge The Record on Appeal*", U.S. District Court for the EDM, SD. Case No. 08-CV-10005; Judge Paul D. Borman. "*Schied v. Thomas Davis, Jr. et al.*" Issued 8/6/08. – This is a ruling in which Petitioner was denied the opportunity to prove that the government defendants were committing "*fraud upon the Court*", that the "*merits*" of previous cases were not litigated by Michigan judges, and that *res judicata* should therefore not apply.

B19 – "*Opinion and Order" (1) Denying Defendant's Motion for Bond for Costs on Appeal; and (2) Denying Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions Against Co-Defendants and Their Attorneys*", U.S. District Court for the EDM. Case No. 08-CV-10005; Judge Paul D. Borman. Issued 8/18/08. (Shows 3 ½ pages of detailed legal explanation for denying the government Defendants' motion and a single unsupported and wholly biased discretionary reason that Petitioner's motion was being denied.)

B20 – "*In Re: Schied*" – "*Order of Dismissal*" on "*Petition for Writ of Mandamus*" and accompanying "*Motion for Criminal Grand Jury Investigation*", U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. Case No. 08-1895; Judges Martha Daughtrey, David McKeague, and Gregory Van Tatenhove, Issued 8/5/08. – These Sixth Circuit judges ruled that Petitioner had a "*conviction*" when he received a pardon in 1983, while refusing to "*litigate*" the facts and merits of Petitioner's allegations that the Lincoln Consolidated School District administration had been, since 2003, freely disseminating an erroneous 2003 FBI report to the public under FOIA, and that the Northville Public School District administration had been doing the same under FOIA with a 2003 Texas "*Agreed Order of Expunction*".

B21 – "*Order*" (unpublished) in the case of "*David Schied v. Jennifer Granholm, Leonard Rezmierski, Fred Williams, Sandra Harris, and Thomas Davis*", U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. Case No. 08-1879. Judges "*chief*" Alice Batchelder, Eugene Siler Jr., and Julia Gibbons. Issued 10/26/09. (These Sixth Circuit judges violated Petitioner's constitutional rights to "*full faith and credit*", disregarding the letter and the spirit of the Texas court "*Order of Expunction*" while issuing a "*fraudulent official document*" stating Petitioner had a "*conviction*" that "*existed*" for a quarter-century after Petitioner had

received two forms of clemency in 1979 and 1983; and while also committing a crime by publicly naming the set aside and pardoned 1977 offense that included an expungement of even the arrest record and for which the government Defendants persist in using to justify the criminal dissemination of non-public government documents in violation of 5 U.S.C. §552a(i) and the National Crime Prevention and Privacy Compact.

B22 – "*Order and Opinion Dismissing Complaint Under Fed. R. Civ. P.8*" in the case of "*David Schied v. Martha Craig Daughtrey, et al.*" (dated 12/29/08) U.S. District Court for the EDM. Case No. 08-14944 – This was a case that Petitioner had brought against federal judges, against the former U.S. Attorney Stephen Murphy (who just prior to the filing of this lawsuit went through the "*revolving door*" between executive and judicial branch to become a federal judge in the very same district), against former U.S. Attorney General Michael Mukasey, and against numerous Department of Justice employees who all had taken action to deny Petitioner appropriate recognition and action against privacy violations and reports of other abuses and deprivation of rights pertaining to FBI reports and the Texas expunction court Order. This ruling of U.S. District Court Judge Lawrence Zatkoff dismissed the entirety of *pro se* and "*forma pauperis*" Petitioner's complaint against three Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals judges and numerous USDOJ state agents. The intent of that Complaint was to clearly depict the high level of gross negligence and malfeasance of duty that existed in the Sixth Circuit court and the Department of Justice, which essentially were both refusing to provide proper service upon Petitioner's previous criminal complaints about Michigan government corruption, including judicial corruption, mostly by members of the same Michigan State Bar by which federal judge Zatkoff was and is still also a listed member. (He is listed as member P-22697) The exhibits included with Petitioner's Complaint were extensive and with an "*Appendix of Referenced Exhibits*" filed by Petitioner that itemized and summarized all of the eighty (80) exhibits. This Order was written by Judge Zatkoff with a distinct purpose, which was to begin a systematic dismissal of the entirety of Petitioner's complaint using "*color of law*" and "*due process*" against Petition so to make the cost to Petitioner prohibitive for serving all of the Defendants properly once again with copies of an entirely new and rewritten complaint and having to re-copy and serve again all 80 exhibits when each stack of documents amounted to over four inches (4") thick of paperwork.

B23 – "*Order and Opinion*" in the case of "*David Schied v. Martha Craig Daughtrey, et al.*" (dated 2/10/09) U.S. District Court for the EDM. Case No. 08-14944 – This subsequent ruling by U.S. District Court judge Lawrence Zatkoff was written in denial of three constitutional motions filed by Petitioner listed below. These three motions were nearly identical to the other constitutional

motions referenced above that were similarly denied and dismissed by the Court of Appeals judges in Michigan which are referenced above and included in their entirety by attachment. This ruling also systematically "*analyzed*" Petitioner's "*Motion for Judge to Disqualify Himself*" and "*Second Brief in Support of Motion for Order for Grand Jury Investigation*" in such way as to also dismiss all of these of Petitioner's motions "*under color of law*" while protecting the government defendants from ever having to answer either of Petitioner's complaints.

- "*Motion to Demand This Court Read All Pleadings Plaintiff Files with This Court, and to Adhere Only to Constitutionally Compliant Law and Case Law, and More Particularly, the Bill of Rights, in its Rulings.*"
- "*Motion to Claim and Exercise Constitutional Rights, and Require the Presiding Judges to Rule Upon This Motion For Superintending Control and a Finding of Contempt Against Defendants*"
- "*Motion to Hear Three Motions Plaintiff-Appellant Properly Filed in Lower Court Yet Still Without Any Hearing*"

B24 – "*Judgment*" and "*Opinion and Order*" dated 3/25/09, in the case of "*David Schied v. Martha Craig Daughtrey, et al.*", (U.S. District Court for the EDM). Case No. 08-14944. – This is a ruling which, in the context of the above-referenced actions, it is clear that Judge Lawrence Zatkoff used "*color of law*" as his tool for completing the systematic dismissal WITH PREJUDICE of Petitioner's "*Amended Complaint*" and while committing yet another instance of criminally victimizing Petitioner by also publishing the name of the 1977 offense for which he was fully aware Petitioner had been provided a "*withdrawal of plea*", a "*dismissal of indictment*", a "*set aside of judgment*", a governor's "*full pardon and restoration of full civil rights*", and even with the remaining "*arrest*" record expunged by an Texas judge's Order PROHIBITING the use or dissemination of the information referenced by that expungement document as Judge Zatkoff was clearly in defiance. Judge Zatkoff dismantled and "*struck*" all of Petitioner's references to his original eighty (80) Exhibits proving as FACT his criminal allegations against three Sixth Circuit Court judges, the U.S. Attorney-turned-U.S. District Court Judge (Stephen Murphy) and numerous USDOJ employees, along with the most relevant parts of Petitioner's "*Amended Complaint*". He then went on to dismiss Petitioner's persistent "*Demand for Criminal Grand Jury Investigation*".

APPENDIX OF OTHER RELEVANT DOCUMENTS

Other documents pertinent to the argument for this Petition for Writ of Mandamus are included in this Appendix C-G to this Petition and are listed as follows:

C1 – "*Sworn Affidavit of Earl Hocquard*" – This undisputed exhibit includes testimony and evidence proving that the Lincoln Consolidated Schools has been criminally misusing and disseminating to the public under the Freedom of Information Act an erroneous 2003 FBI identification record that was used in 2003 to deprive Petitioner of his right to equal employment opportunity and his statutory right, under 28 CFR §50.12 to "*challenge and correct*" that FBI report, and while intending to cause harm to Petitioner from 2003 to the present. The Affidavit includes a number of "exhibits" in presentation of evidence of the latest crime of the Lincoln Consolidated Schools administrators that he witnessed.

C2 – "*Sworn Affidavit of Earl Hocquard*" – This undisputed exhibit includes similar testimony and evidence from Earl Hocquard showing that the Northville Public Schools has been criminally disseminating, under FOIA, a 2004 Texas court "*Order of Expunction*" that Petitioner had obtained by successfully exercising his federal right, under 28 CFR §50.12, to have the 2003 (and 2004) erroneous FBI identification records updated and "*cleared*". The Affidavit includes a number of "exhibits" in presentation of evidence of the latest crime of the Northville Public Schools administrators that he witnessed.

D1 – Defamatory letter dated 11/5/11 and written by then "*interim*" superintendent Sandra Harris – This letter flagrantly publishing the name of the 1977 offense and essentially labeling Petitioner David Schied a "*liar*" and a "*convict*" despite her having clear knowledge that the FBI report she referenced (as a "routine background check") was erroneous. This letter was disseminated to a "*laundry list*" of school district employees who had nothing to do with evaluating Petitioner's qualifications for employment. It was placed into the district's public personnel files along with the erroneous FBI report and disseminated to the public with other "nonpublic" documents under the Freedom of Information Act after Sandra Harris had denied Petitioner's right to challenge and correct the accuracy of the FBI identification record used as the basis for this letter placing Petitioner on an unpaid suspension from his contracted employment.

D2 – Attorney Grievance Commission complaint and Criminal complaint against Michigan attorney MICHAEL WEAVER – This set of documents contain a compilation of four "*exhibits*" as Petitioner's 2008 and 2011 "*attorney misconduct*" complaints and Petitioner's 2010 "*sworn and notarized criminal complaint*" with the Oakland County Prosecutor JESSICA COOPER. The Attorney Grievance Commission dismissed both the first (2008) and the second (April 2011) complaint without any supporting basis except the "*color of law*" and discretion. The Oakland County Prosecutor, a member of the same Michigan State Bar, did the same with Petitioner's 9-page sworn and notarized complaint supported by both law and referenced evidence, except she refused to even place her discretionary denial into writing.

D3 – Email correspondence from Northville Public Schools' HR Director Katy Doerr-Parker – These documents, written a year apart in 2004 and again in 2005, reassure Petitioner of Parker's original employment offer, which was based upon her personal promise that the NPS district administration would hold clemency documents entrusted by Petitioner to be "*sealed*" and held outside of the HR office for the district's protection until after the 2004 Texas court "*Order of Expunction*" could take proper effect and "*clear*" the erroneous information from the Texas records and the FBI identification records being disseminated in 2003 and 2004. These written documents show that the NPS had promised that once Petitioner could verify that the FBI records were successfully challenged and cleared, the District would either "*return or destroy*" the "*incriminating*" clemency documents.

D4 – Two honorary letters of recommendation – These two letters were written on Petitioner's behalf by two school principles employed by the Northville Public Schools (NPS) covering the period between the time Petitioner was hired by the NPS District (February 2004) and the time Petitioner had proven, through the submission of another set of fingerprints in Summer 2005, that Petitioner had successfully challenged and corrected the 2003 and 2004 FBI reports and that the Texas court "*Order of Expunction*" had taken proper effect and had obliterated all the erroneous information contained in the erroneous FBI identification records.

D5 – Letter of inquiry and solicitation of information from Brighton Area Schools (BAS) – This is a form letter the HR Director sent to the HR Department of the Northville Public Schools (NPS), under Michigan's Revised School Codes, in request for "*unprofessional conduct which occurred IN YOUR EMPLOY*". The document shows that in response, the NPS administrator David Bolitho misleadingly checked the box indicating that Petitioner HAD a record of such "*unprofessional conduct* (under employ at NPS)" and that Bolitho had sent the form back signed and in accompaniment of the Texas court "*Order of Expunction*" referencing an act that had occurred in 1977 when Petitioner

was a teenage youth (and without providing information about the two letters of recommendation that Petitioner had actually otherwise earned "*while under employ*" at the NPS.

E1 – Petitioner's criminal felony complaint against MSP police detective and a letter of Answer from the MSP supervisor – Petitioner's letter complained about a Michigan State Police (FRED FARKAS) detective who ignored for nearly ten (10) months Petitioner's previous crime report against Sandra Harris at the Lincoln Consolidated Schools (as also supported with evidence), and who thereafter perjured his own rewording of Petitioner's crime report in his own official words in 2006. The "*answer*" letter shows that detective's MSP supervisors conducted a "*mock*" investigation in response to Petitioner's complaints about the detective, and "*Inspector*" Beth Moranty wrote an unsupported "*discretionary*" letter of "*colorful*" reply stating they "*found no violation*" whatsoever by the detective.

E2 – Petitioner's criminal felony complaint against MSP police detective and a letter of Answer from the assistant prosecutor for Washtenaw County, Michigan – Petitioner had previously notified the Washtenaw County Prosecutor BRIAN MACKIE and his "*assistant*" JOSEPH BURKE about the crime report perjured by the MSP detective, which Petitioner had delivered previously with supporting evidence of the original "*predicate*" crimes by Lincoln School District administrator Sandra Harris. Mackie refused to reply except to rely upon his assistant Burke, and Burke's letter "*cherry-picked*" a single Michigan law so to reason his own personal disregard for the key items of evidence and to draw up a fraudulent discretionary determination that "*no crime was committed*". Petitioner then wrote a second letter to prosecutor Burke to address the "*color of law*" and "*abuse of discretion*" exemplified by his "*answer*" letter.

E3 – Fax cover letter and "Incident Report" (inclusive of "Narrative Report") from the Northville City Police to the assistant prosecutor for the "Public Integrity" division of the Wayne County Prosecutor in Detroit – These exhibits demonstrate that in July 2006, Northville City Police officer ANTHONY TILGER sent Petitioner's crime report to the Wayne County "*assistant prosecutor*" ROBERT DONALDSON along with a fax cover letter requesting that the local police not be compelled to "*handle*" this matter as the Northville Public Schools' administrative offices where the crimes were being committed were literally within a "*stone's throw*" away from the police headquarters. The Narrative Report shows return favors (i.e., bribery and acceptance of bribe) being delivered between the police and prosecutor to deprive Petitioner of his state constitutional rights to criminal protection from "*the accused*".

E4 – Petitioner's two letters addressing Petitioner's allegations of foul play between the Northville City (NVC) Police and the Wayne County assistant prosecutor and the response letters from the NVC Police "*captain*" and assistant prosecutor – The "bribery" and retaliatory acts between the NVC Police and the assistant Wayne County prosecutor were recorded by Petitioner as they occurred, with "*play-by-plays*" emails and letters about these secondary crimes of *cover-up* and *obstruction* going to the "*government affairs*" bureau chief and "*public employment*" and "*tort*" division chief employed by the Michigan Attorney General Mike Cox. These two letters were accompanied by many others written by Petitioner documenting his numerous complaints to the Michigan Attorney General about these corrupt government activities.

E5 – Letters of responses written by Wayne County Commissioner Laura Cox, wife of (former) Michigan Attorney General Mike Cox, from the "Special Operations Division" of the Wayne County Prosecutor, and from the Wayne County Committee on Government Relations – These letters were written in response to Petitioner receiving a referral from SENATOR BRUCE PATTERSON to Laura Cox after he was unsuccessful in getting a response from AG Mike Cox about Petitioner's report of felony government corruption. These letters demonstrate a blind reliance by the Wayne County Commissioners upon the detective work of the Wayne County Prosecutor's office, and the means by which all these government offices deprived Petitioner of his constitutional rights to a "*proper*" address of his criminal allegations.

F1 – Four letters of response from the Office of the Michigan Attorney General in 2006 – Each one of these letters was written in response to separate Complaints and/or rebuttals in reiteration of criminal corruption complaints submitted by Petitioner. The letters demonstrate a "*pattern of deprivation of rights*" through "*colorful*" rhetoric and mock investigation in answer to Petitioner's numerous criminal complaints.

F2 – Cover letter of inquiry written by CONGRESSMAN THADDEUS McCOTTER and 21-page letter of follow-up complaint from Petitioner David Schied – The letter from Congressman McCotter asks directly for a "*proper review*" by the Attorney General to the criminal allegations regarding the Lincoln Consolidated Schools and the Northville Public Schools. The 21-page letter from Petitioner to AG Cox recounts all of the facts and the evidence already provided to the Michigan attorney general and questions the integrity of the Government Affairs Bureau Chief and the Government Elections, Employment and Tort Division Chief since they did nothing after being provided with "play-by-play" evidence of the bribery scandal occurring between the NVC Police and the Wayne County Prosecutor, and after

receiving a three-inch (3") thick package of similar corruption occurring between the Michigan State Police and the Washtenaw County Prosecutor.

F3 – Two letters of response from the Criminal Division "chief" of the Michigan Attorney General's office – Being disguised as written on Attorney General Mike Cox's behalf in response to Congressman McCotter's letter and Petitioner's 21-page letter, this Criminal Division *chief* DAVID TANAY wrote two letters, one carefully drafted to hide the fact that he was responding to Congressman Thaddeus McCotter's inquiry, and the other written to Petitioner to reiterate that the Attorney General would continue to answering these criminal corruption complaints with only deception, rhetoric, malfeasance, and "*color of law*".

G1 – Page 1 of Petitioner's first letter of complaint to the Michigan Department of Civil Rights (MDCR) and the first response letter of denial ("*under color of law*") from the MDCR – Petitioner's first page of his complaint shows a detailed subject line detailing four distinct reasons for writing the MDCR, including a basis pertaining to the instant case of "*Student A*" now in the U.S. Supreme Court as "*Application No. 10A1018*". The answer letter of denial lists denials based on "color of law" claims such as "*not within our jurisdiction... to file complaints against attorneys*", "*conviction discrimination is not protected under state and federal civil rights laws*", the MDCR "*does not have jurisdiction to investigate judicial decisions*", "[the MDCR] *does not investigate negligence claims*".

G2 – Petitioner's extensive 15-page response to the MDCR's first letter of "*denial of service*" and the MDCR's second and final decision letter of continued denial of services to Petitioner – Petitioner appealed the previous denial of service by the MDCR under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act and the state equivalent of the Elliott-Larson Civil Rights Act (ELCRA) with 15 pages of argument. Yet, the MDCR again denied the appeal without reason or any address of Petitioner's arguments.