

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

David Schied, one of the *Sovereign* American People
recognized by the U.S. CONSTITUTION;
a totally and permanently disabled *RECENT*
QUAD-AMPUTEE; *CRIME VICTIM*;
Common Law and Civil Rights *sui juris*
GRIEVANT / CLAIMANT / BENEFICIARY
“BENEFICIARY”

**Court of Appeals
21-2873**

v.

U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, et al
Counterclaimant / Defendant / Respondent / Trustee
“CO-TRUSTEES”

**On CLAIM and APPEAL
from the USDC-SDWD
Civ. No. 21-5035
CHIEF JUDGE:
Roberto Lange
JUDGE: Lawrence Piersol**

**With DEMAND FOR FEDERAL SPECIAL GRAND JURY INVESTIGATION
(under 18 USC §3332)**

DISABLED / BENEFICIARY David Schied - RELATOR P.O. Box 321 SPEARFISH, S. DAKOTA 57783 605-580-5121 (all calls	versus	Lawrence Piersol and Roberto Lange and Matthew Thelen; <i>acting</i> as the latest in a long line of “UNITED STATES” <i>principles</i> and <i>agents</i> usurping the Powers otherwise “ <i>Reserved to the States respectively</i> ”, and/or “ <i>Retained by the [Sovereign] People</i> ”.
--	--------	---

INTRODUCTION TO THIS “BRIEF” ON “CLAIM” AND “APPEAL”

BENEFICIARY/RELATOR David Schied, an alleged victim of an attempted murder (just recently in 2018) and criminal coverup by agents of the CO-TRUSTEES of the UNITED STATES, the STATE OF MICHIGAN, and DTE ENERGY, was horrendously transformed into a totally and permanently disabled quad-amputee.

Thereafter – just this year (2021) while living as a totally and permanently disabled man living peaceably and reasonably safely under self-quarantine by sworn, notarized DECLARATION in compliance with the longstanding 2020-2021 “*CDC ORDER OF EVICTION MORATORIUM*” – BENEFICIARY/RELATOR was subsequently criminally “*evicted*” in the dead of Winter. He thus was forced – during a NATIONAL PANDEMIC and without being provided required ADA “*accommodations*” or constitutional “*due process*” by STATE or UNITED STATES court officers – to flee the numerous *crime syndicates* and *domestic terrorists* operating under the false auspices of being *usurpers* and *insurrectionists* otherwise masquerading as the “*government*” of the STATE OF MICHIGAN. Throughout this period, the UNITED STATES agents and principals were all notified and remained silent in “*tacit agreement*” with criminal coverup of these proven crimes.

BENEFICIARY/RELATOR now is declaring himself as a “*state refugee*” living in safety with the sovereign People of the STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA jurisdiction. Herein below BENEFICIARY/RELATOR, as persistent “*CRIME VICTIM*,” as repeated “*GRIEVANT*,” and as long-lasting common law “*CLAIMANT*,” now STATES:

These instant COMMON LAW actions of “*CLAIMS*” and “*APPEAL*” come in opposition to the dated and signed – and undated and unsigned – actions deliberately taken by the actors and jesters who have long been collectively operating a “*continuing financial crimes enterprise*” as the so-called “*UNITED*

STATES DISTRICT COURT”; one *usurping* the Federal jurisdiction of the “EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, SOUTHERN DIVISION” (hereafter “USDCEDM”) in the CITY OF DETROIT in the CHARTER COUNTY OF WAYNE, and the other *usurping* the Federal jurisdiction of the “DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA, WESTERN DIVISION” (hereafter “USDCSDWD”) in RAPID CITY (and/or SIOUX FALLS) of the STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA.

The **FACTUAL** basis for this “*notice*” is by Reason and **Evidence** that the “*official*” acts of the “*Court Clerks*”, the and the so-called “*Judges*” of USDCEDM and the USDCSDWD have long been engaging in much more than the mere “*appearance*” of a “*DEEP STATE*” criminal conspiracy to commit SEDITION, TREASON, and INSURRECTION against the sovereign People, against the sovereign States of Michigan and South Dakota, and against the sovereign (i.e., the organic body politic or “*True State*”) of The United States of America, using a plethora of combined RICO CRIMES and DOMESTIC TERRORIST ACTS.

**This is my country! Land of my birth!
This is my country! Grandest on earth!
I pledge thee my allegiance, America, the bold,
For this is my country to have and to hold.**

(Lyrics by Don Raye
and music by Al
Jacobs)

**This is my country! Land of my choice!
This is my country! Hear my proud voice!
I pledge thee my allegiance, America, the bold,
For this is my country to have and to hold.
CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 26.1, BENEFICIARY/RELATOR David Schied, as well as all others “*similarly situated*” by “*backward-looking-access-to-court*” cases being presented by BENEFICIARY/RELATOR acting in the capacity of a “*Private, Public Proxy*” in COMMON LAW – which is akin to working in the capacity of a “*Private Attorney General*” in the “*statutory*” realm – herein certify that he/they are all natural persons being presented (not “*represented*”) with a “*sovereign*” status as “*We, The [American] People*”, the posterity of those “*Founding Fathers*” who created and/or established and ordained the original, “*organic*” Constitution for the united States of America.

On the other hand, those designated as “CO-TRUSTEES” by this case – though many are named and being sued in their “*private*” capacities in one (of two “*inextricably intertwined*” cases) as natural persons – are named in this both cases in their “*CORPORATE*” capacities as well. As such, virtually every one of these CO-TRUSTEES are neither operating under the Common Law nor under “*Constitutional*” forms of governments; but are actually instead being disclosed herein – and in the “*other*” case (i.e., of *David Schied v. UNITED STATES, et alia*) – as an illegitimate CORPORATION licensed to do business in illegitimate fashion by FEDERAL and/or STATE administrative agencies otherwise masquerading as legitimate “*governments*” through various forms of meaningless rhetoric and the

dumbing down of the American “*body politic*” through propagandizing and outright FRAUD, SEDITION, and TREASON. This they do in both “*wheel*” and “*chain*” conspiracies, using unconstitutional applications of the “*codified*” and “*statutory*” systems, along with the misuse and misapplication of “*administrative procedures*”, in gross violation of both the “*letter*” and the “*spirit*” of both STATE and UNITED STATES laws and the RULES ENABLING ACT.

Thus, while U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, INC. and its varied agents are clearly acting as a CORPORATION and with CORPORATE status, even those named CO-TRUSTEES that are licensed “*officers*” and “*franchises*” of FEDERAL and STATE “*governments*” are also being “*disclosed*” herein as “*CORPORATIONS*”, pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 26.1.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTION TO THIS “ <i>BRIEF</i> ” ON “ <i>CLAIM</i> ” AND “ <i>APPEAL</i> ”	i
CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT	iv
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	vii
JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT WITH “ <i>STATEMENT OF ‘ISSUES’ PRESENTED FOR REVIEW</i> ”	1
THE SOVEREIGN PEOPLE’S GRANTING “ <i>ORIGINAL</i> ” JURISDICTION TO THE “ <i>DISTRICT COURT</i> ” DOES NOT GRANT ANY “ <i>JUDGE</i> ” ENTITLEMENT TO “ <i>EXCLUDE</i> ” THE PEOPLE’S COMMON LAW JURISDICTION	4
OPENING SUMMARY ABOUT THE LOWER COURTS’ <i>FRAUDULENT</i> DISMISSALS OF NOT JUST ONE, BUT TWO (2) CASES NEAR SIMULTANEOUSLY	22
SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION <u>FOR THE “<i>EIGHTH CIRCUIT</i>”</u> AS WELL AS FOR “ <i>WE, THE PEOPLE</i> ”	37
COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION	39
TIMELINESS OF THIS APPEAL	51
STATEMENT OF THE FACTS RELEVANT TO THE ISSUES PRESENTED HEREIN FOR REVIEW	53
PIERSOL “ <i>AFFIRMATIVELY OMITTED</i> ” ALL REFERENCED <u>AFFIDAVITS</u> WHEN DISMISSING THIS CASE AS BEING “ <i>WITHOUT FACTS</i> ”	63
ARGUMENT – SUMMARY WITH DETAILS, CONTENTIONS, AND STANDARDS FOR REVIEW	77
SHORT CONCLUSION WITH PRECISE RELIEF SOUGHT/DEMANDED ...	84
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE [Rule 32(g)(1)]	86

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

FEDERAL

18 U.S.C. § 4 (“ <i>Misprision of Felony</i> ”).....	67
18 U.S.C. § 225 (“ <i>Continuing Financial Crimes Enterprise</i> ”).....	10, 34
18 U.S.C. §§241-242 (“[<i>Conspiracy to</i>] <i>Deprive of Rights</i> ”).....	8, 46
18 U.S.C. §1961-1968 (“ <i>RICO</i> ”).....	7
18 U.S.C. § 2331(5) (“ <i>Domestic Terrorism</i> ” defined).....	20-21
18 U.S.C. § 2381 (“ <i>Treason</i> ”).....	4-5,12,13,16,20,25-26,34-35,38,46, 52, 59, 60,77,81
18 U.S.C. § 3771 (“ <i>Crime Victims’ Rights</i> ”).....	67
28 U.S.C. § 1654.....	23
28 U.S.C. § 1915(e).....	1, 6-8, 12, 21
42 U.S.C. §1983.....	8, 46
4 CFR § 22.6.....	61
31 CFR 594.311.....	17, 21
Americans With Disabilities Act.....	7, 42
Bill of Rights (U.S. Constitution).....	65
<i>Bowsher v. Syner</i> . 478 U.S. 714, 721 (1986).....	79
<i>Buckley v. Valeo</i> , 42 U.S. 1, 438 (1976) (<i>per curiam</i>).....	79
<i>Crawford v. Washington</i> , 541 U.S. 36, 42-50 (2004).....	83
<i>Data Disc, Inc. v. Systems Tech. Assocs., Inc.</i> 557 F.2d 1280 (9 th Cir. 1977).....	64

Declaration of Independence.....	17
<i>Erickson v. Pardus</i> , 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007).....	10
False Claims Act.....	23
<i>Faretta v. California</i> , 45 L Ed 2d 562, 592 (1975).....	23
Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure (“FRAP”), Rule 28.1(f)(1).....	53
Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure (“FRAP”), Rule #31(a)(1).....	30-31
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP) Rule 56(c)(4), 56(d),(e), and (f).....	63
First Amendment (U.S. Constitution).....	28
Fourteenth Amendment (U.S. Constitution).....	8
<i>Heckler v. Cheney</i> , 470 U.S. 821, 832 (1985).....	79
<i>INS v. Chadha</i> , 462 U.S. 919, 951 (1983).....	79
<i>Jackson v. Metropolitan Edison Co.</i> , 419 U.S. 345 (1974).....	83
<i>John Robertson, Petitioner v. UNITED STATES, Ex Rel. Wykenna Watson</i> , 60 U. S. ____ (2010) No. 08-6261 as “ <i>Brief for the UNITED STATES as</i> <i>AMICUS CURIAE supporting Respondent</i> ”.....	79, 83
<i>Native Am. Council of Tribes v. Solem</i> 691, F.2d 382 (8 th Cir. 1982).....	10
Rules Enabling Act.....	6, 20, 52, 54, 56, 58, 85
<i>Schied v. DEPOSITOR’S INSURANCE COMPANY, ET AL</i> (Piersol <u>FRAUD</u>)...	15, 51
<i>Schied v. Khalil</i> , 2016 WL 4727477 (<i>E.D. MI</i>).....	25, 44, 49-50, 53-56, 61-62, 67-68, 75-76, 80-81
<i>Schied v. UNITED STATES, et alia</i> (2021).....	1-3, 6-7, 12, 14-15, 17-19, 22-23, 25-28, 32-40, 43-45, 48-51, 53-57, 59-60, 62-82, 84

Seventh Amendment (U.S. Constitution).....	4, 10-11
Thirteenth Amendment (U.S. Constitution).....	8
Tort Claims (Act).....	5, 8, 17, 19, 21, 33, 35,
<i>United States v. Gorman</i> , 613 F.3d 711 (7th Cir. 2010).....	36
<i>United States v. Nixon</i> , 418, U.S. 683, 693 (1974).....	79
<i>United States v. Smyth</i> , 104 F.Supp. 283 (1952).....	82
<i>United States v. Throckmorton</i> , 98 U.S. 61 25 L.Ed. 93.....	15
<i>United States v. Williams</i> , 504 U.S. 36 (1992).....	82
<i>United Tech Corp. v. Mazer</i> , 556 F. 3d 1260 (11 th Cir. 2009).....	64
<i>White v. FCI, USA, Inc.</i> , 319, F. 3d 672 (5 th Cir. 2003).....	64

STATE

MCL 168.422 (“judicial office becomes vacant upon neglect or refusal to subscribe to Oath of Office”).....	50
<i>Cochran v. Sess</i> , 372, 61 N.E. 639.....	17
<i>Herman v. City of Buffalo, et al</i> 108 N.E. 451 (N.Y. 1915).....	17
<i>New York Supplement</i> (Vol. 143) (New York State Reporter, Vol 177) containing the decisions of the Supreme and Lower Courts of Record of New York State.....	17
<u>Common Law MAXIMS</u>	15, 64-65, 78
“An Unrebutted Affidavit Stands as Truth in Commerce”.....	64

<i>“Fraud vitiates everything”</i>	15, 78
<i>“He who bears the burden ought also to derive the benefit”</i>	64
<i>“He who does not deny, admits”</i>	64
<i>“He who does not repel a wrong when he can, occasions it”</i>	65
<i>“He Who Leaves the Battlefield First Loses by Default”</i>	65
<i>“In Commerce, Truth is Sovereign”</i>	65
<i>“Justice delayed is Justice denied”</i>	27
<i>“Truth is Expressed in the Form of an Affidavit”</i>	65

Other Authorities

<i>A Treatise on the Law of Injunctions</i> (4th ed. 1905) by James L. High.....	83
--	----

<i>AMICUS IN TREATISE: Interpreting the Unconstitutional History of Federal and National Governance of the Patriotic ‘People’ and Other ‘Free Persons’ Inhabiting the United States”</i> (313 pages).....	43
---	----

<i>Commentaries</i> . William Blackstone.....	83
---	----

<i>COMMON LAW ‘WRIT OF ERROR CORAM NOBIS’ IN OPPOSITION TO PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE OF ‘CRIMINAL FRAUD AND CONSPIRACY TO DEPRIVE OF RIGHTS’ INVOLVING ‘JUDICIAL USURPERS’ AND ‘CLERKS OF THE COURTS’ AS ‘AGENTS’ OF THE NAMED ‘CO-TRUSTEES’ OF THE CASE CAPTIONED ABOVE”</i> ; [with] <i>FINDING OF CONTEMPT AND “CERTIFICATION OF FAULT/DEFAULT WITH ‘DEFAULT JUDGMENT’ AND COMMON LAW ‘LEDGER OF [TREBLE] DAMAGES’</i> ; [and with] <i>‘NOTICE OF ‘CLAIM OF APPEAL’ FOR THE REASONS CITED ABOVE AND BASED UPON ‘OVERRIDING AND PALPABLE ERRORS’ AND GROSS OMISSIONS OF FACTS; AND INTENTIONAL [TORTUOUS] VIOLATIONS OF THE ‘RULES ENABLING ACT’</i>	20, 49, 55
---	------------

<i><u>DECLARATION of David Schied (dated 10/15/20) Invoking the ‘Common Law’ Jurisdiction and/or the ‘Federal’ Jurisdiction in Halting Eviction via QUO WARRANTO, Notice of ‘INTENT TO LIEN’, Claims of DISABILITY’ and ‘MEDICAL FRAILITY’, and ‘To Prevent Further Spread of COVID-19’</u></i> (40 pages).....	43
<i><u>DECLARATION OF TRUTH OF GRIEVANT/CLAIMANT DAVID SCHIED Concerning the Documentation of the Compounding of Racketeering Crimes by State and National Continuing Financial Crimes Organizations”</u></i> (11/27/17).....	72-74
<i><u>From JFK to 9/11: Everything is a Rich Man’s Trick</u></i> , (video documentary).....	78
<i><u>How Less Is More: The Unraveling of the Inextricable Intertwinement Doctrine Under United States v. Gorman</u></i> , Jaime L. Padgett, 6 SEVENTH CIRCUIT REV. 196 (2010).....	36
<i><u>The Holy Bible</u></i> (John 8:32); (Lev. 19:11-13); (Mat. 10:22).....	65
<i><u>MEMORANDUM OF LAW & JURISDICTION</u></i>	81
<i><u>MEMORANDUM OF LAW: Based on the First Amendment Petition Clause And Evidence of Domestic Terrorism”</u></i>	80
<i><u>MEMORANDUM OF LAW: Pertaining to ‘Whether judicial ‘legislation’ is Constitutional’; and ‘whether judicial ‘independence’ authorizes ‘bad’ behavior’; and, ‘whether ‘substantive’ Evidence can be ‘procedurally’ stricken [or dismissed]’; and, ‘whether Evidence of a ‘Pattern and Practice’ of government coercion constitutes ‘Treason’ and/or ‘Domestic Terrorism’”</u></i>	81
<i><u>MEMORANDUM OF RIGHTS of (We), “The PEOPLE”: To Assemble; To Local Governance; and To Withdraw Consent Through State and Federal Jury Nullification, Through Grand Jury Presents, Through Private Prosecutions, and Through Other Executions of Customary Law and The Laws of Commerce”</u></i> (183 pages).....	25, 44, 81
<i><u>Sealing Court Records and Proceedings: A Pocket Guide</u></i>	27
<i><u>The Evolving Uniform Commercial Code: From Infancy to Maturity to Old Age</u></i> . 26 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 691 (1993). McLaughlin, Gerald T.....	65

U.C.C. §1-103.....	65
--------------------	----

Universal Commercial Code.....	65
--------------------------------	----

<i>Writ of Coram Nobis...Finding of Contempt ... Fault/ Default...Default Judgment...Ledger of Damages</i>	20, 54-56, 58, 64
--	-------------------

AUTHORITIES ALREADY FURNISHED TO THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT AND THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT (per Footnotes ## 24 and 36 of this instant filing, incorporated herein as if repeated in entirety verbatim)

<u>Per Footnote #24</u>	49
--------------------------------------	----

As found at:

http://constitutionalgov.us/SupremeCourtOfLaw/Cases/SchiedVsRoberts/PrimaryEvidenceDocuments/010816_QuoWarrantoon6thCirJudges_ALL.pdf

FEDERAL

Articles of Confederation.....	
Bill of Rights.....	
Common Law.....	
Constitution (organic) for the united States of America.....	
Constitution of the United States.....	
Declaration of Independence.....	
Magna Carta.....	
Article I of the United States Constitution.....	
Article III of the United States Constitution... ..	
Article IV, §1 of the United States Constitution.....	
Article VI, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.....	
First Amendment of the United States Constitution.....	
Ninth Amendment of the United States Constitution.....	
18 U.S.C. § 4 (“Misprision of felony”).....	
18 U.S.C. § 241.....	
18 U.S.C. § 242.....	
18 U.S.C. § 1512.....	
18 U.S.C. §1028(t) (<i>Attempt and Conspiracy to commit Fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents, authentication features, and information</i>).....	
18 U.S.C. § 1509 ("Obstruction of court orders").....	
18 U.S.C. §1961 ("Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations").....	
18 U.S.C. § 2381 (“Treason”).....	

18 U.S.C. §2382 (“ <i>Misprision of Treason</i> ”)
18 U.S.C. § 2384 (“ <i>Seditious conspiracy</i> ”)
18 U.S.C. § 1505 (“ <i>Obstructing an official proceedings before department, agency or committee</i> ”)
18 U.S.C. § 1510 (“ <i>Obstruction of criminal investigations</i> ”)
18 U.S.C. § 1512 (“ <i>Tampering with a witness, victim, or informant</i> ”)
18 U.S.C. §2331
18 U.S.C. § 3332 (“ <i>special grand jury</i> ”)
28 U.S.C. §1691
42 U.S.C. §1983 (“ <i>Civil Action for Deprivation of Rights</i> ”)
42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2 (“ <i>Unlawful Employment Practices</i> ”)
Act of May 26, 1790
Act of March 27, 1804
Civil Rights Act of 1964
Civil Rights Attorney Fees Award Act of 1976
E-Government Act (2002)
E-Sign Act (2000)
Family Support Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-485, October 13, 1988, 102 STAT. 2343)
Individuals With Disabilities in Education Act
Privacy Act of 1974 [5 U.S.C. 552a(i)(1)]
Racketeering Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (“RICO Act”)
28 CFR §50.12
Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2007 (TRIPRA)
Uniform Commercial Code
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 9(b)
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 23
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 23(g)(1)(A)(iv)
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 45(b)(1)
Sixth Circuit Guide to Electronic Filing, 1.8
Sixth Circuit Guide to Electronic Filing, 9.1
Sixth Circuit Guide to Electronic Filing, 9.2
Sixth Circuit Guide to Electronic Filing, 10.1
Sixth Circuit Guide to Electronic Filing, 10.2
Sixth Circuit Guide to Electronic Filing, 13.1
<i>Bradley v. Fisher</i> , 13 Wall. 335, 20 L.Ed. 646 (1872)
<i>Cohens v. Virginia</i> , 19 U.S. (6 Wheat) 264, 404, 5 L.Ed 257 (1821)
<i>Ex parte Milligan</i> , 71 U.S. (4 Wall.) 2 (1866)
<i>Lee v. Southern Home Sites Corp.</i> , 444 F.2d 143 (5th Cir. 1971)
<i>Newman v. Piggie Park Enterprises</i> , 390 US 400 (1968) (<i>per curiam</i>)

Piper v. Pearson, 2 Gray 120.....
U.S. v. Will, 449 U.S. 200, 216, 101 S.Ct. 471, 66 L.Ed.2d 392, 406 (1980).....

MICHIGAN

Constitution of Michigan.....
Michigan Code of Judicial Conduct.....
MCL §15.243(l) (Freedom of Information Act).....
MCL 18.351-[Crime Victim's Compensation Board (definitions)].....
Michigan Revised School Codes.....
MCL 380.1230.....
MCL 380.1230(a).....
MCL 380.1230(g)
MCL 691.1407.....
MCL 750.10 (Michigan's Penal Code).....
MCL 750.157a (Michigan's Penal Code).....
MCL 750.368 (Michigan's Penal Code).....
MCL 750.478a (Michigan's Penal Code).....
MCL 761.1.....
MCL 764.1(a).....
MCL 764.1(b).....
MCL 767.3.....
MCL 767.60 – (*Larceny and false pretense cases*).....
MCL 767.61 – (*indictment for larceny or larceny by conversion; description of instruments*).....
MCL 780.623 (Michigan's Set Aside Law).....
MCR 7.212 (G).....
MCR 2.114(A).....
MCR 2.114(C)(1).....
MCR 2.116(C)7.....
MCR 2.118.....
MCR 2.207.....
MCR 3.303(A)(1).....
MCR 3.303(A)(2).....
MCR 3.303(B).....
MCR 303(D).....
MCR 303(Q)(1).....
MCR Rule 6.101 (Rules of the Court).....
MCR 7.101(8)(1)(a).....
MCR 7.101(c)(1).....
MCR 7.101(c)(2).....

MCR 7.101(H)(4).....	
MCR 7.101(H)(5).....	
MCR 7.204(C)(2).....	
MCR 8.119(F).....	
Michigan Court Rules.....	
<i>David Schied v. Brighton Area Schools</i> (No. 10-25106-CD).....	
<i>David Schied v. Northville Public Schools, et al.</i>	
<i>David Schied v. Sandra Harris and the Lincoln Consolidated Schools</i>	

OTHER STATES

Article 55.03 (Tex. Code of Crim. Proc.).....	
Article 60.06(b) (of Texas Code of Criminal Procedures).....	
Texas Attorney General Dan Morales (May 31, 1995) (<i>Opinion DM 349</i>).....	
Texas Attorney General John Cornyn (July 10, 2001) (<i>Opinion JC-0396</i>).....	
Texas Code of Criminal Procedure, Title 1, Chapter 55 (pertaining to “ <i>Expunction of Criminal Records</i> ”)	
Tx.C.Crim.Proc., Title 1, Article 55.03(1) (“ <i>Effect of Expunction</i> ”).....	
Tx.C.Crim.Proc., Title 1, Article 55.04(1) (“ <i>Violation of Expunction Order</i> ”)...	
Tx.C.Crim.Proc., Title 1, Article 55.04(2) (“ <i>Violation of Expunction Order</i> ”)...	
Tx.C.Crim.Proc., Title 1, Article 55.04(3) (“ <i>Violation of Expunction Order</i> ”)....	

OTHER AUTHORITIES

<i>Memorandum of Law</i> (by David Schied).....	1, 6, 31, 61, 77, 82
State Integrity Investigation Results (2012; and 2015), Center for Public Integrity (“ <i>Corruption Risk Report Card for Michigan</i> ”).....	
U.S. Department of Homeland Security Presidential Directive-J (2004).....	
Weaver, Justice Elizabeth, “ <i>Judicial Deceit: Tyranny and Unnecessary Secrecy at the Michigan Supreme Court</i> ”	

CASES LEFT UNRESOLVED EXCEPT BY FRAUD UPON THE COURT

<i>David Schied v. Martha Daughtrey; David McKeague; Gregory Tatenhove; Stephen Murphy; Terrence Berg; Rod Charles; Andrew Arena; Margaret Love; Michael Mukasey; Maria O’Rourke; and Shanetta Cutlar</i>	
<i>David Schied v. Leonard Rezmierski; David Bolitho; Katy Doerr Parker; Northville Public Schools Board of Education; Larry Crider; Robert Donaldson; Warren Evans; James Gonzales; James Hines; Maria Miller; Benny Napoleon;</i>	

Wayne County Prosecutor’s Office; Wayne County Sheriff’s Department; Kym Worthy; Jane Doe; and John Doe.....

David Schied v. Northville Public School District.....

David Schied v. Sandra Harris and Lincoln Consolidated Schools, et al.....

David Schied v. State of Michigan; Gov. Jennifer Granholm; Kelly Keenan; Michelle Rich; Michigan State Administrative Board; Attorney General Mike Cox; Commissioner Laura Cox; Wayne County Commission; Wayne County Office of the Prosecutor; Michigan State Police; Northville City Police; Michigan Department of Civil Rights; Michigan Dept. of Education; Wayne County RESA; Northville Public Schools Board of Education; Scott Snyder; Katy Parker; David Bolitho; Leonard Rezmierski; Keller Thoma law firm; Sandra Harris; Lincoln Consolidated Schools Board of Education; Michigan Supreme Court et. & DOES 1-30.....

David Schied v. Michigan State Court Administrator; Michigan Department of Civil Rights; Superintendent and Board of Education for the Michigan Department of Education; Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth; Michigan State Administrative Board via the Office of the Michigan Attorney General; DOES 1-20.....

David Schied v. Ronald Ward, Ken Hamman, Kirk Hobson, Patricia Meyer, Karen Ellsworth, Jessica Murray, Jennifer Bouhana, Patricia Ham, and Joe D. Mosier, both in their individual and official capacities (USDC EDM case No. 09-12374).....

David Schied (on behalf of “Student A”) v. Scott Snyder, Lynn Mossoian, Kenneth Roth, Richard Fanning, Jr. David Soebbing, Harvatee Saunto, Donna Paruszkiewicz, Mary E. Fayad, Susan Liebetreau, Donald S. Yarab, Catherine D. Anderle, (all in their individual capacities) and Arne Duncan (in hid official capacity as USDOE) (USDC EDM case No. 5:09-cv-11307.....

Per Footnote #36	81
-------------------------------	----

As found at: https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/083116_2ndCrimeReport2USAttnyGeneralLynchonEvents%2BMagisCrime/Exhibits2AffidavitFollowUptoUSAGLynch/EX_60_EntireMemorandumofLawinSupporInterlocutAppeal111815.pdf

FEDERAL

Art. I § 8, cl.9 (U.S. Constitution).....	
Art. III, § 1 (U.S. Constitution).....	
Art. III, § 3, clause 1 (U.S. Constitution).....	
Bill of Rights (U.S. Constitution).....	
Due Process Clause (U.S. Constitution).....	
Federal Judiciary Act of 1789, ch. 20, 1 Stat. 92.....	
Rules Enabling Act of 1934 (Act of June 19, 1934).....	
Rules of Decision Act of 1789.....	
Supremacy Clause (U.S. Constitution).....	
Thirteenth Amendment.....	
Act of June 25, 1948 c. 646, 62 Stat. 991.....	
Title 18 U.S.C. §4.....	
U.S.C. §2331.....	
U.S.C § 3771.....	
U.S.C. § 1652 (1982).....	
U.S.C. §2071.....	
U.S.C. §2072.....	
Title 28 of the United States Code.....	
<i>American Ins. Co. v. Canter</i> , 26 U.S. (1 Pet.) 511 (1828).....	
<i>Antoine v. Byers & Anderson, Inc.</i> , - U.S. -, -, 113 S.Ct. 2167, 2171 L.Ed.2d 391 (1993).....	
<i>Bi-Metallic Co. v. Colorado</i> , 239 U.S. 441, 36 S. Ct. 141,60 L. Ed. 372, 1915 U.S.....	
<i>Burns v. Reed</i> , U.S., 111 S. Ct. 1934, 1946, 114 L. Ed. 2d 547 (1991).....	
<i>Davidson Bros. Marble Co. v. Gibson</i> , 213 U. S. 10, 213 U. S. 18.....	
<i>Erie Railroad v. Tompkins</i> , 304 U.S. 64 (1938).....	
<i>Forrester v. White</i> , 484 U.S. 219, 229-30, 108 S. Ct. 538, 545-46, 98 L. Ed. 2d 555 (1988).....	
<i>Glidden Company v. Zdanok</i> , 370 U.S. 530 (1962).....	
<i>Hanna v. Plumer</i> , 380 U.S. 460, 471 (1965).....	
<i>Hudson v. Parker</i> , 156 U. S. 277, 156 U. S. 284.....	
<i>Meek v. Centre County Banking Co.</i> , 268 U. S. 426, 268 U. S. 434.....	
<i>Northern Pipeline Co. v. Marathon Pipeline Co.</i> , 458 U.S. 50 102 S. Ct. 2858 (1982).....	

<i>O'Donoghue v. United States</i> , 289 U.S. 516 (1933).....	
<i>Sibbach v. Wilson</i> , 312 U.S. 1 (1941).....	
<i>Venner v. Great Northern Ry. Co.</i> , 209 U.S. 24, 209 U. S. 35.....	
<i>United States v. Tillamooks</i> , 329 U.S. 40; 341 U.S. 48.....	
<i>United States v. Will</i> , 449 U.S. 200, 217 218 (1980).....	
<i>Willy v. Coastal Corp.</i> 503 U.S. 131 (1992).....	
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.....	
Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 3.....	
Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 4.....	
Local Court Rules for the Eastern District of Michigan.....	
Statutes at Large.....	

MICHIGAN

MCL 18.351.....	
MCL 750.10.....	
MCL 761.1.....	
MCL 764.1(a).....	
MCL 764.1(b).....	
MCL 767.3.....	
MCR Rule 6.101.....	

OTHER

Bone, Robert. <i>Mapping the Boundaries of a Dispute: Conceptions of Ideal Lawsuit Structure From the Field Code to the Federal Rules</i> , 89 Colum. L. Rev. 1, 21 n.42 (1989).....	
--	--

Burbank, Stephen. <i>The Rules Enabling Act of 1934</i> . (1982) pp. 1018-1197.....	
---	--

Carrington, Paul. <i>Substance and Procedure in the Rules Enabling Act</i> . Duke Law Journal. (Vol. 1989; No. 2; April).....	
---	--

Cook, Walter, “ <i>Substance</i> ” and “ <i>Procedure</i> ” in the <i>Conflict of Laws</i> , 42 Yale L.J. 333, 335-336 (1933).....	
--	--

Cordero, Richard. <i>Exposing Judges’ Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Wrongdoing</i>	
---	--

Fields, Gary, and Emshwiller, John. <i>As Criminal Laws Proliferate, More Are Ensnared</i> (7/23/11) Wall Street Journal.....	
---	--

- Fletcher, George. Parochial Versus Universal Criminal Law. Journal of International Criminal Justice (Vol. 3) (2005).....
- Fletcher, George. Rethinking Criminal Law (Oxford: Oxford University Press, reprinted 2000).....
- Fullerton, Maryellen. No Light at the End of the Pipeline: Confusion Surrounds Legislative Courts. 49 Brook L. Rev. (1983).....
- Main, Thomas. The Procedural Foundation of Substantive Law. Washington University Law Review, Vol. 87 (2009).....
- Martin, Michael. Inherent Judicial Power: Flexibility Congress Did Not Write Into the Federal Rules of Evidence. 57 Tex. L. Rev. Vol. 2; pp.167-202. (Jan. 1979).....
- Mishkin, Some Further Last Words on Erie-The Thread, 87 Harv. L. Rev. 1687 (1974).....
- Risinger, Michael. “Substance” and “Procedure” Revisited: With Some Afterthoughts on the Constitutional Problems of “Irrebuttable Presumptions,” 30 UCLA L.Rev. at 190, 201 (1982).....
- Scott, Actions at Law in the Federal Courts, 38 Harv. L. Rev. 1, 3-4 (1924).....
- Silberman, Linda. Judicial Adjuncts Revisited: The Proliferation of Ad Hoc Procedure. 137 Univ. of Penn. L. Rev. (1989) pp. 2131-2178.....
- Weaver, Justice Elizabeth and Schock, David. Judicial Deceit: Tyranny and Secrecy at the Michigan Supreme Court.....
- Weinstein, Jack. After Fifty Years of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: Are the Barriers to Justice Being Raised? University of Pennsylvania Law Review. Vol. 137.....

**“JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT” WITH “STATEMENT OF
‘ISSUES’ PRESENTED FOR REVIEW”**

In his very opening paragraph of his **fraudulent** “*SCREENING ORDER OF DISMISSAL*”, the so-called “*senior judge*” Lawrence Piersol, himself acknowledged as FACT that a “second lawsuit filed in the DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA” existed, and that this “*first COMPLAINT was dismissed as frivolous*”.

U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, INC., DOES #1-20,

Defendants.

Plaintiff, David Schied, filed a pro se lawsuit. Doc. 1. Schied moves for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. Doc. 2. He also filed “beneficiary’s” motions: (1) to proceed in forma pauperis; (2) for the filing fees in CM-ECF to be waived; and (3) for service by the United States Marshal Service. Docs. 3-5. This is Schied’s second lawsuit filed in the District of South Dakota. His first Complaint was dismissed as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). See Schied v. United States et. al, 5-21-CV-05030-LLP, Doc. 14 at 37-38 (D.S.D. July 29, 2021).

What Piersol’s fraudulent “*ORDER*” **grossly omits** however, is the FACT that **HE was the very one to dismiss “*first Complaint*” case**; and that **he had been, immediately prior, “ordered”** (just the very day before dismissing this “*first Complaint*”) **by his supervisory “*chief [federal] judge*” Roberto Lange, to (unconstitutionally and criminally) throw this instant “*second* [previously unrelated] case” in the same UNCONSTITUTIONAL and CRIMINAL fashion.** See below as EVIDENCE of Roberto Lange’s admitting his “AID [AND ABET]” of

these crimes under the mere conclusory (i.e., without supporting EVIDENCE) and FRAUDULENT “color” of his CONSPIRACY to criminal acts being carried out as somehow constituting the “*administration of justice*” in this instant “Schied v. U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, INC. et alia” case.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA
WESTERN DIVISION

DAVID SCHIED, ONE OF THE SOVEREIGN
AMERICAN PEOPLE; A TOTALLY AND
PERMANENTLY DISABLED RECENT
QUAD-AMPUTEE; CRIME VICTIM;
COMMON LAW AND CIVIL RIGHTS SUI
JURIS GRIEVANT/CLAIMANT
BENEFICIARY,

Plaintiff,


vs.

U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, INC., and
DOES #1-20,

Defendants.

5:21-CV-05035-

ORDER REASSIGNING CASE


To aid in the administration of justice by reassigning this case to a District Judge who has
handled another case brought by this same pro se litigant, it is hereby

ORDERED that the above-captioned case is reassigned from the Honorable Jeffrey L.
Viken to the Honorable Lawrence L. Piersol for all future proceedings.


DATED this 27th day of July, 2021.

BY THE COURT:



ROBERTO A. LANGE
CHIEF JUDGE

Notably, on p.9 of the Lawrence Piersol's "Memorandum and Opinion and Order" DISMISSING that first of these two *inextricably intertwined* cases ¹, Lawrence Piersol – himself acting as the embodiment of "*the Court*" – stated "[Beneficiary] *has set up his own court to deal with such issues...[and] seeks empaneling of a Grand Jury and Petit Jury...damages...and other relief.*"



This statement demonstrates that this federal "judge" has acknowledged Beneficiary's own assertions that he seriously distrusts his own government, as embodied in part by the Federal "Judiciary"; and that indeed, acting in the COMMON LAW tradition, Beneficiary has claimed the creation and/or reinstatement of "*The People's*" own ARTICLE III "*COURT OF RECORD*".

¹ For "*the RECORD*" these two "*inextricably intertwined*" cases are herein defined as being: 1) "*David Schied v. UNITED STATES, et alia, Lower Court #21-5030, 8th Cir. COA #2809* and, 2) "*David Schied v. U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL. INC., et alia, Lower Court #21-5035, 8th Cir. COA #21-2873.*"

THE SOVEREIGN PEOPLE'S GRANTING "ORIGINAL" JURISDICTION TO THE "DISTRICT COURT" DOES NOT GRANT ANY "JUDGE" ENTITLEMENT TO "EXCLUDE" THE PEOPLE'S COMMON LAW JURISDICTION

The opening above is significant in terms of this "Jurisdictional Statement" because it proves the intent of the SEVENTH AMENDMENT, being that "[I]n suits at common law..." reexamination of facts 'tried' by a jury" (of the sovereign American "People") is to be conducted ONLY "according to the rules of COMMON LAW".

Thus, the Seventh Amendment holds a GUARANTEE to "We, The People" – including Beneficiary as a "statutorily protected" disabled "person" – that "the right of trial by jury shall be preserved". As one of those sovereign People, Beneficiary has clearly "tried" applying his JURY DEMAND – only to no avail, due to the conspiracy to *corruption, sedition, and treason* taking place at the lower court levels, which is beyond the reasonable control of Beneficiary as one of "We, The People", the highest form of "government" in the Constitutional Republic of America.

Yet, relative to the "Issues Presented for Review", Lawrence Piersol acted outside of this mandate by the U.S. CONSTITUTION, and unilaterally overstepped his permissive bounds of "Original" jurisdiction to usurp "Exclusive" jurisdiction by substituting his own "Opinion" and "Order" for both a "Trial [Petit] Jury" and the "Grand Jury" of the People. He did this seditiously and with malicious *intent* – after initially working with the "Clerk of the Court" to "SEAL" the contents of this

case from the scrutiny of the Sovereign American People. He then summarily "dismissed" the entirety of the ORIGINAL COMPLAINT, which was chock full of stated COMMON LAW CLAIMS – as well as “statutory” ones – for DAMAGES and OTHER RELIEF. **Piersol did this tortuously; while treasonously barring Beneficiary’s rightful access to any such “Court” comprised of such other Sovereign American People.**

David Schied, one of the Sovereign American People; a totally and permanently disabled *RECENT QUAD-AMPUTEE*; *CRIME VICTIM*; Common Law and Civil Rights *sui juris* *GRIEVANT / CLAIMANT / BENEFICIARY* (“*BENEFICIARY*”) JUDGE Lawrence Piersol

v.
U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, INC.
and DOES #1-20
Counterclaimant / Defendant / Respondent / Trustee
(“*TRUSTEE*”)

BENEFICIARY’S “COMMON LAW” and “ARTICLE III” COURT OF RECORD with “ORIGINAL COMPLAINT” for VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS of a “*totally and permanently disabled quad-amputee*”; for CIVIL “RICO”; and CRIMINAL “LARCENY” (including “WIRE FRAUD”) and with DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL and DEMAND FOR FEDERAL “SPECIAL GRAND JURY INVESTIGATION”

Piersol even did all of this without the so-called “Defendants”, on whose behalf he “appeared” to be acting, even knowing that they were being sued – precluding their being properly and legally “served” by the U.S. Marshals with copies of the complaints against them; precluding the due process “discovery” of FACTS; and precluding all else reasonably and meaningfully defining “access” to the so-called “U.S. DISTRICT COURT”.

These actions by Lawrence Piersol are substantive constitutional violations, as well as violations of the RULES ENABLING ACT OF 1934.

Moreover, Piersol did so fraudulently using the very same “conclusory” process of “*threadbare recitals*” of the law that he alleged Beneficiary to have used in his “*first case*” against the “UNITED STATES, et alia”; in feeble attempt to justify his own unfounded claim that “*Schied’s entire complaint is frivolous*”. Piersol repeatedly cited the “color” of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) (as his FALSE CLAIM that Beneficiary had been all along (in that “*first Complaint*”) been “*making claims*” and “*assertions*” that are “*frivolous*”, while “*rest[ing] on ... mere labels ,,, and legal conclusions*”, so “*has no private right of action*”.

5:21-CV-05035-LLP

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA WESTERN DIVISION

Schied v. U-Haul Int'l.

Decided Aug 2, 2021

Plaintiff, David Schied, filed a pro se lawsuit. Doc. 1. Schied moves for leave to proceed

in forma pauperis. Doc. 2. He also filed “beneficiary’s” motions: (1) to proceed in forma

pauperis; (2) for the filing fees in CM-ECF to be waived; and (3) for service by the United States

Marshal Service. Docs. 3-5. This is Schied’s second lawsuit filed in the District of South Dakota.

His first Complaint was dismissed as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). *See Schied v.*

United States et. al, 5-21-CV-05030-LLP, Doc. 14 at 37-38 (D.S.D. July 29, 2021).

The date (7/27) that Roberto Lange reassigned the case to Piersol.

August, 2021						
Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
25	26	27	28	29	30	31
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31	1	2	3	4

These CRIMES were committed just two (2) workdays apart.

Not only did Piersol make direct reference and instruct reviewers of this instant “*second case*” against U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, INC to “*see*” and refer to the “*first [inextricably intertwined] case*” when considering the *invalidity* of Beneficiary’s numerous “*allegations*” and “*assertions*” of FACTS about both the “*UNITED STATES, et alia*” and this instant “*U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, INC. et alia*” case. Piersol also used the 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) (“granting leave to proceed *forma pauperis* [without payment of fees and costs]” as his sole justification for “*dismissing*” ALL of the FACTS and EVERY one of Beneficiary’s CLAIMS against these U-HAUL “*CO-TRUSTEES*”, to include the following:

1) **RACKETEERING INFLUENCED CORRUPT ORGANIZATION (“RICO”):**

C. Legal Analysis

1. Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) Claims

In Counts I and VII, Schied references RICO. Doc. 1 at 69-71, 80-83. He claims that U-Haul is “operating with a top-down hierarchical design of power structure” *Id.* at 69. He asserts the company is operating as “Racketeers” and “as a Continuing Financial Crimes Enterprise” to “defraud American consumers of both money and labor for private profit.” *Id.* at 69-70. He believes they mishandle customer complaints and that they tampered with his ability to contract. *Id.* He claims that there was a “pattern and practice” of RICO violations because U-Haul substituted the contract with the contracted driver’s name. *Id.* at 81.

Haul sent the refund check to the contracted driver and then corrected the mistake. *See id.* at 8-10.

Although this Court is bound to liberally construe Schied’s pro se complaint, this Court is unwilling to guess upon what prohibited racketeering activity under 18 U.S.C. § 1961(1) that U-Haul was allegedly participating in. Schied’s RICO claims are riddled with legally conclusive assertions. Thus, his RICO claims asserted in Count I and VII are dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i-ii).

2. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)

In Count II, Schied raises a violation of the ADA. Doc. 1 at 71-73. Schied is a “totally and permanently disabled quad-amputee” and claims

2) **AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (“ADA”) VIOLATIONS:**

a review of the list of private entities that are considered a place of “public accommodation” this Court concludes that U-Haul does not fall under a place of “public accommodation.” See 42 *7 U.S.C. § 12181(7)(A-L). Schied’s ADA claims are dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i-ii).²

3) CIVIL RIGHTS CLAIMS – Violations of the 13TH and 14TH AMENDMENTS:

3. Civil Rights Claims

Schied asserts that U-Haul violated his rights under the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments. *See* Doc. 1 at 73-74. He also claims that U-Haul has conspired to deprive him of his constitutional rights. *Id.* at 76-78. He brings these claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *See id.* "[T]o state a claim for relief under § 1983, a plaintiff must allege sufficient facts to show '(1) that the defendant(s) acted under color of state law, and (2) that the alleged wrongful conduct deprived the plaintiff of a constitutionally protected federal right.' " *Zutz v. Nelson*, 601 F.3d 842, 848 (8th Cir. 2010) . . .

Here, Schied does not offer factual allegations that would support that U-Haul was a state actor. Because U-Haul is not acting under the color of state law for the purposes of § 1983 liability, Schied's claims asserted in Counts III, IV, and V are dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i-ii).

4) GENERAL CRIMINAL CLAIMS:

4. General Criminal Claims

Schied claims that U-Haul committed theft, larceny, and bank fraud. *See* Doc. 1 at 83-86. He asserts that U-Haul retained his banking information "under fraudulent pretense[s]" *Id.* at 83. Schied specifically alleges violations of 18 U.S.C. §§ 241 and 242. *Id.* at 85. But there is no private right of action under these criminal statutes. *Mousseaux v. United States Comm'r of Indian Affairs*, 806 F.Supp. 1433, 1437 (D.S.D. 1992); *See United States v. Wadena*, 152 F.3d 831, 846 (8th Cir. 1998) (stating that "Courts repeatedly have held that there is no private right of action under [18 U.S.C.] § 241"). Further, this Court extends this rational to Schied's generalized criminal claims against U-Haul. He has no private right of action. His claims in Count VIII are dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i-ii).

5) COMMON LAW TORT:

5. Common Law Tort Claims

In Count VI, Schied vaguely mentions the "common law tort[s]" of "tortious misrepresentation" and fraud. Doc. 1 at 78-80. After review of his assertions, he rests on legal conclusions of "pattern and practice," "misrepresentation," and "fraud." *See id.* Schied cannot rely on mere labels and conclusions to support these claims. *Torti*, 868 F.3d at 671. This Court finds that Schied's entire Complaint is frivolous. He names Does #1-20 as a defendant but does not allege any facts against this entity. *9

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

1. That Schied's Complaint is dismissed as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i-ii). Schied's pending motions, Docs. 3, 4, 5, are denied as moot.

Yet, compare the above as Piersol's FRAUDULENT assertions about the captioning of Beneficiary's "COUNTS" to the ACTUAL COUNTS that Beneficiary filed as pictured below as copied from Beneficiary's "TABLE OF CONTENTS":

SEPARATE COUNTS AND ARGUMENTS.....	65
COUNT ONE – RACKETEERING AND CORRUPTION (“<i>RICO</i>” VIOLATION)....	65
COUNT TWO – AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT VIOLATION (“<i>CIVIL RIGHTS</i>”).....	67
COUNT THREE – THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT VIOLATION (“<i>CIVIL RIGHTS</i>”).....	69
COUNT FOUR – FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT VIOLATION (“<i>CIVIL RIGHTS</i>”).....	70
COUNT FIVE – TORTUOUS CONSPIRACY TO) DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW (“42 U.S.C. § 1983”).....	72
COUNT SIX – TORTUOUS MISREPRESENTATION AND FRAUD (a.k.a. “COMMON LAW TORT” and “FRAUDULENT BUSINESS PRACTICES”).....	74
COUNT SEVEN – EXTORTION and WIRE FRAUD (“<i>RICO</i>”).....	76
COUNT EIGHT – THEFT, LARCENY, AND BANK FRAUD (“<i>FINANCIAL CRIMES</i>”).....	79
CONCLUSION AND DEMAND FOR RELIEF.....	82
SWORN AFFIDAVIT OF TRUTH.....	83

So how in “*Hell*” does the convoluting, combining, and “*generalizing*” Beneficiary’s specific CLAIMS – as supported by a verifiable and unrebutted **SWORN AFFIDAVIT OF TRUTH** – become “*liberally construed*” for purposes of DISMISSAL OF ALL CLAIMS by this so-called “*senior judge*” of the UNITED STATES?

The EIGHTH CIRCUIT is otherwise “*bound*” by law to “*liberally construe*” the CLAIMS of Sovereign Americans – i.e., those “*unrepresented*” by the BAR members operating the U.S. DISTRICT COURTS nationwide otherwise as an illegal MONOPOLY and “*Continuing Financial Crimes Enterprise*” – as Piersol himself admits, though doing so for fraudulent underlying purposes to “obstruct” justice rather than to facilitate “equal access” of pro per or pro se litigants to these (what are supposed to be and otherwise believed to be by most unwary “ordinary” American People) “ARTICLE III COURT(s) OF RECORD”.

Lundahl, 2018 WL 3682503 at *1. Pro se complaints must be liberally construed. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007); see also *Native Am. Council of Tribes v. Solem*, 691 F.2d 382 (8th Cir. 1982).

Lawrence Piersol, having dismissed the entirety of Beneficiary’s “COMPLAINT(s)” summarily as “*frivolous*” – not just once but TWICE within two business days, and in a clear conspiracy to deprive of rights with the criminal “aiding and abetting” of three tiers of hierarchical authority (i.e., the “*chief judge*”, the “*senior judge*”, and the “*court clerk*”) – served to undermine both the constitutional “*letter*” and the “*intent*” of SEVENTH AMENDMENT – by replacing the “*trial of the facts*” and the “*trier of the facts*”, i.e., being the

(written) DEMANDED "jury" and "grand jury" of one of the sovereign People (David Schied), with the "judges" own LIMITED and BIASED "opinion(s)".

Moreover, such a conspiracy between these two "judicial usurpers" (Lange and Piersol) and this "Clerk of the Court" Matthew Thelen, went even further to simultaneously "deny" and dismiss Beneficiary's ancillary "MOTIONS", which the lower "court" designated as "Docs #3, 4, 5". ²

² These documents (#3,4,5) were respectively named as follows and are to be found at the link designated at the end of this instant Footnote. **Any rational person will instantly see, upon viewing the actual contents of each of these "Motions" filed by Beneficiary, why these USDC "judges" would not want these incriminating documents released to the public as a matter of official "record"; and therefore, dismissed them under the fraudulent pretense of being "moot" in the context of the superseding levels of other FRAUD committed by Piersol and his criminal accomplices, Lange and Thelen.**

Doc. #3:

BENEFICIARY David Schied's legally signed "MOTION TO PROCEED IN DISTRICT COURT WITHOUT PREPAYING FEES OR COSTS" (20 pages plus Cover Pages & Table of Contents); WITH ACCOMPANYING COMPLETED "APPLICATION" FOR THE SAME ("Short Form": 2 pp);

Doc. #4:

BENEFICIARY David Schied's legally signed "MOTION FOR CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE OF SUBPOENA AND COMPLAINT BY U.S. MARSHAL WITHOUT PREPAYING FEES OR COSTS" (7 pages)

Doc. #5:

BENEFICIARY David Schied's legally signed MOTION FOR INDIGENT AND DISABLED FILER TO AVOID EXPENSIVE COPY AND MAIL COSTS BY WAIVER AS A CM/ECF "E-FILER" (36 pages);

Altogether, the full content of these files are currently found in Beneficiary's own TRUTHFUL – "Common Law ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD" – at: http://www.ricobusters.com/?page_id=478

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

1. That Schied's Complaint is dismissed as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i-
- ii). Schied's pending motions, Docs. 3, 4, 5, are denied as moot.


DATED August 2, 2021.

ATTEST:

MATTHEW W. THELEN, CLERK



BY THE COURT:



Lawrence L. Piersol
United States District Judge

These SEDITIOUS and TREASONOUS acts by Piersol and his accomplices, Lange and Thelen, not only (criminally) **deprived** Beneficiary of his rightful (i.e., constitutionally guaranteed) access to the courts (**under "color of law"**) as a declared “whistleblower” (in the “first case” against over 115 listed “CO-TRUSTEES” captioned as “David Schied v. UNITED STATES, et alia”) and “totally and permanently [recently] disabled quad-amputee” **swearing upon EVIDENCE to support his SWORN allegations of being the subject of an ATTEMPTED MURDER by the CO-TRUSTEES.** ³ So too **this “lower court judge” has deprived "The Accused" of their constitutionally protected individual due process rights to a "speedy trial" on the (criminal) allegations of BOTH cases.**

³ Again, these criminal co-conspirators were named specifically as agents and principals of the **UNITED STATES**, the **STATE OF MICHIGAN**, and **DTE ENERGY** in the “first” case of “Schied v. UNITED STATES, et al”.

These above described acts of INSURRECTION by these so-called "*officers of the court*" (Lange, Piersol and Thelen) are all reviewable by (a GRAND JURY of "*We, the People*" as well as) this COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT having "*Personal Jurisdiction*" over all the judges and clerks of the lower federal courts. This is particularly as these acts relate to "**Judicial Misconduct**" **complaints** as provided by articulation herein, which is **descriptive of numerous "errors and omissions" that should be financially covered by some form of SURETY of "performance bonds", "blanket bonds", or other forms of "insurance" against the "bad behaviors" of government officials and employees like this who are NOT entitled to "immunity" for these types of SEDITIOUS and TREASONOUS acts.**

These above described acts of INSURRECTION by these so-called "*officers of the court*" (Lange, Piersol and Thelen) are all reviewable by this COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT (and/or any other future "*COURT OF RECORD*" organized by "*We, The People*" for such purpose) in context of all three of the basic categories of lower court decisions "*on appeal*" – ACCORDING TO THE COMMON LAW – precisely because the "*right to trial by jury*" has been both perpetually "*preserved*" (even until now) and previously **DEMANDED in writing** as a matter of this instant "**ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD**".

Notably, the “Three Basic Categories of Decisions Reviewable on Appeal”, each with its own standard of review are: 1) decisions on “*questions of law*” being “*reviewable de novo*”; 2) decisions on “*questions of fact*” being “*reviewable for clear error*”; and, 3) decisions on “*matters of discretion*” being “*reviewable for 'abuse of discretion'*”.

As such, **all three of the above** – in light of the above concisely stated latest FACTS about these newest “*agent provocateurs*” ⁴ to be added to the extensive list

⁴ **Being a French term for “*inciting agent*”, this term is entirely appropriate here in describing CO-TRUSTEES** – particularly those holding “*discretionary*” powers such as STATE and UNITED STATES “*judges*” and those otherwise operating in the many hierarchical branches of the “ADMINISTRATIVE STATE” where the Sovereign American People are being COERCED to “*exhaust*” themselves on chasing after a never-ending “*chain*” of “*due process*” options and “*administrative remedies*” – **because**, as is demonstrated in the “*first case*”, and by its reference to a near eighteen (18) year “*backward-looking-access-to-court*” history of DENIAL by “procedure undermining substance”, **it is clear that the *judicial usurpers* of Lawrence Piersol, his federal “*chief judge*” CO-CONSPIRATOR Roberto Lange, along with “*clerk*” Matthew Thelen, have all three committed these CRIMINAL ACTS of TORT against Beneficiary as a means for setting up David Schied for “*entrapment*” ... by monitoring his response to such acts that would “*shock the conscience*” of any other “*normal*” Sovereign American People, such as those who may be sitting on a constitutionally recognized “*petit*” or “*grand*” JURY.**

In other words, by repeatedly DENYING Beneficiary David Schied his “*right to access*” the STATE and UNITED STATES courts, **the underlying implication is that these named “*insurrectionists*” and “*domestic terrorists*” are “just waiting” for this sovereign, law-abiding American man to eventually “lose his self-control” amidst the never-ending “redress of grievances” channels being COERCED upon him**; occurring under the alternative threat of Beneficiary persistently “*losing*” each successive “*battle*” and “The People’s War” overall against this overwhelming “*government*” CORRUPTION.

of “*CO-TRUSTEES*” of the UNITED STATES, et alia (being named in the “*first case*” to now include Lange, Piersol and Thelen) – **are to be reviewed consistently with the COMMON LAW jurisdiction and “according to the rules of common law” as constitutionally commanded; being in accordance with the mandates upon the Federal government by the Sovereign “We, The People” under the SEVENTH AMENDMENT to the U.S. CONSTITUTION as the “Supreme Law of the Land” and the premiere “Public Trust” document.**

In such light of their being “*parallel*” jurisdictions running concurrently throughout this matter in which the COMMON LAW “MAXIM” applies, that “Fraud vitiates everything”⁵, this COA for the EIGHTH CIRCUIT is hereby put on

These named “*insurrectionists*” and “*domestic terrorists*” thus, are *just waiting* for Beneficiary to take “*due process shortcuts*” and/or to execute “*illegal force*” (or offer the hint to even the THREAT of force) of his own, which are otherwise his only true options for asserting a more realistic and tangible “*remedy*” more within his available level of “*rational*” and “*peaceful*” control. **Some refer to this form of “legal abuse” and its consequences in “Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder” as “Legal Abuse Syndrome”. Others simply say, “Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable.”** (Quote from U.S. President John F. Kennedy)

⁵ See also, UNITED STATES v. THROCKMORTON, 98 U.S. 61 25 L.Ed. 93. “*There is no question of the general doctrine that fraud vitiates the most solemn contracts, documents, and even judgments.” In Beneficiary’s “first case”, the “Judgment” was so *prima facie* fraudulent, it was levied by Piersol and Thelen against DEPOSITERS INSURANCE COMPANY, et al, who was never even named or involved in that case in any way whatsoever; that is, until Piersol and Thelen “discretionarily” pulled that “fictional” entity from their own collective “posteriors” by ABUSES of that joint discretion.*

“CONSTRUCTIVE NOTICE” by the following linked twenty (20) pages captioned,

“CRIMINAL COMPLAINT OF TREASON”, located at:

<https://constitutionalgov.us/SupremeCourtOfLaw/Treason-USA/1-TreasonComplaint-ConstretiveNotice-AllOfficers%26Agents-V1.5.pdf>

Constructive & Public Notice: To:

All Government Office-Holders
at All Levels of Government

with-in the Geographical Boundaries of
our People's Constitutionally-Lawful & De-Jure

“United States of America”,

& including all Cities, Counties, & States; & All Agents & Franchisees there-of;

Take Constructive-Notice of this Complaint

that a singular & Powerfully Organized 'Criminal Racketeering Syndicate' is routinely Terrorizing & Coercing many good Executive, Legislative, & Judicial-Officers of Our Nation; all in such manners as empowers them to Pillage & Plunder Our Common American People; & that those Evils more specifically result not only in routine “Obstruction of Justice”, but also in Literal Aggressive/Violent & Socially-Parasitical “Class Warfare”; & that these Evils inherently result in what effectively amount to:

“Treason”!

Note please also, that,
this document is here-by being presented to each & all of you
by an Organized American National Assembly of Constituent Electors;
each of whom are here-by partaking in the collective Sovereignty of our traditional
American National Organic Body-Politic, as “Electors”, & “Constituents”;
because: “All Power is Inherent in the People”.

We Intend to Organize & Deputize Multitudes of Patriotic American Qualified-Electors,
to conduct constitutionally-legitimate “Judicial Investigations”;
as to whether or not You are Personally Responding as a ‘Responsible Public-Servant’
to the Accusations contained here-in about
the Massive Criminal-Conspiracy which is Destroying our American Nation.

When you are so confronted; do Not Pretend to be Ignorant of the Accusations contained here-in.

If you might find any accusations or assertions contained here-in to be “In Error”;
then, in a timely manner, Notify Us of Your “Objection”.

Contact information for our leaders is contained at the end of this & related documents.

Notice to the Agent, is Notice to the Principal.

Notice to the Principal, is Notice to the Agent.

<https://ConstitutionalGov.US/SupremeCourtOfLaw/Treason-USA/>

~~~~~ V-1.5; 2020-March. ~~~~~

Constructive-Notice: Criminal-Complaint of Treason Page 1 of 20.

Piersol also intentionally ignored the CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS (“CFR”) on how the laws cited by Beneficiary were supposed to be applied by this so-called “judge, which was thus, a blatant abuse of discretion.

For instance, **31 CFR 594.311** defines the term “domestic terrorism” as it applies to “acts dangerous to human life”<sup>6</sup>, particularly **acts of gross negligence and intentional torts** where “inherently dangerous activities” are involved.

In this case, minimally, there are significant FACTS and EVIDENCE against “CO-TRUSTEES” U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, INC. (in this “second” of two “inextricably intertwined” cases) and the government “officials” (in the “first case” against the UNITED STATES, et al) that this U.S. DISTRICT COURT “judge” in South Dakota summarily dismissed as “frivolous” in BOTH cases – without trial,

---

<sup>6</sup> Note that in the “first” of these two *inextricably intertwined* cases, Beneficiary clearly **defined the laws defining "domestic terrorism" and the "case law" defining "dangerous to human life" as certain acts which threaten the Rights to Life, Liberty, Property, and to the Pursuit of Happiness of OTHER PATRIOTIC AMERICANS.** See p.209, New York Supplement (Vol. 143) (New York State Reporter, Vol 177) containing the decisions of the Supreme and Lower Courts of Record of New York State, in discussion of the judge’s address to the jury in Herman v. City of Buffalo, et al while referencing Cochran v. Sess, 372, 61 N.E. 639, when defining “defects” of a “defendant’s work, which as a reasonably prudent man knew, or should have known, was of such character as to render the structure [of that “work”] a menace or danger to human life ... one so threatening as to constitute an impending danger to persons in the enjoyment of their legitimate rights”, being embodied in the DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, as written by Thomas Jefferson, as the **Rights to Life, Liberty, Property, and to the Pursuit of Happiness.** This New York Supplement is located at:

<http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/New-York-Supplement-ActsDangeroustoHumanLife-p209244.pdf>



without “*Discovery*” proceedings, and without any other form of “*due process*” being applied – constituting both “*inherently dangerous activities*” and “*acts dangerous to human life*” being underscored as follows:

- 1) In the “*first case*”, the CO-TRUSTEES of the FBI were involved in an ATTEMPTED MURDER of David Schied and the U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE has been covering it up by denying “*requests for documents*” under the laws of government transparency;
- 2) In the *first case*, the LOCAL and STATE governments in the STATE OF MICHIGAN were instrumentally involved in the *CRIMINAL* EVICTION of a totally and permanently disabled quad-amputee (David Schied) just after a blizzard, in the middle of a Michigan winter, during a nationwide COVID pandemic, in spite of a Federal “*Eviction Moratorium*” (containing both civil and criminal penalties for violation); and in spite of the disabled person issuing his sworn DECLARATION in compliance with federal mandates. Similarly, **numerous named CO-TRUSTEES of the UNITED STATES gross negligently engaging in that “*criminal coverup*” reside in WASHINGTON, D.C., the STATE OF MICHIGAN, and (now as recently revealed with that *first case*) in the STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA.**
- 3) In this “*second case*”, Beneficiary documented fully sixteen (16) different *agents* of U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL who were serving the principal as the U-HAUL

founder and its corporate “*Board*” members in carrying out “*policies and practices*” that deprive disabled persons such as Beneficiary David Schied of his inalienable and sacred Rights to “*Life, Liberty, Property, and the Pursuit of Happiness*” using unscrupulous CORPORATE tactics. See again, the TABLE OF CONTENTS (below) for Beneficiary’s lower court filing listing each agent and the pages for the specific activities in which these agents engaged to tortuously deprive Beneficiary resolves of his numerous “*compounding*” FACTUALLY RECORDED complaints.)

|                                       |    |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| CONCISE STATEMENT OF FACTS.....       | 8  |
| FACTS RELATED TO U-HAUL AGENT #1..... | 8  |
| U-HAUL AGENT #2.....                  | 9  |
| U-HAUL AGENT #3.....                  | 10 |
| U-HAUL AGENT #4.....                  | 12 |
| U-HAUL AGENT #5.....                  | 13 |
| U-HAUL AGENT #6.....                  | 15 |
| U-HAUL AGENT #7.....                  | 18 |
| U-HAUL AGENT #8.....                  | 19 |
| U-HAUL AGENT #9.....                  | 21 |
| U-HAUL AGENT #10.....                 | 22 |
| U-HAUL AGENT #11.....                 | 24 |
| U-HAUL AGENT #12.....                 | 35 |
| U-HAUL AGENT #13.....                 | 41 |
| U-HAUL AGENT #14.....                 | 53 |
| U-HAUL AGENT #15.....                 | 61 |
| U-HAUL AGENT #16.....                 | 62 |

The lower court “*judge*” Lawrence Piersol also *fraudulently* stated that the above **detailed** <sup>7</sup> **CLAIMS** are “*frivolous*”; and that those – who are like Lawrence

---

<sup>7</sup> In the “*first case*”, Lawrence Piersol cited Beneficiary’s “*262-page, 460-paragraph Complaint*” while implying that specifically naming over one-hundred CO-TRUSTEES as being involved in several multi-tiered hierarchies of STATE and UNITED STATES “*Departments, Bureaus, Divisions, Sections, Units, Agencies, and Offices*” engaging in “*chain*” and “*wheel*” conspiracies of “*Racketeering*” and

Piersol in acting OUTSIDE of their *official* capacities as *usurpers* of the People's *enunciated* and *delegated* sovereign powers – are to be granted "[sovereign and *other*]immunity"; in spite of his (and their) committing what amounts to "*war crimes*" and "*crimes against humanity*", being also characteristic of "*domestic terrorism*" as defined by the U.S. CONGRESS in 18 U.S.C. §2331(5).<sup>8</sup> (*See top of next page*)

---

"Corruption" ("RICO"), *Sedition, Treason, Insurrection, and Domestic Terrorism*, was somehow NOT written "*concisely*"!

<sup>8</sup> For proper reference to 18 U.S.C. §2331(5) as the authority defining "*domestic terrorism*", **see page 14** (of 21) of Beneficiary's final lower court filing captioned as shown below...

v.

U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, INC., DOES 1-20  
"CO-TRUSTEES"

Civ. No. 21-5035

JUDGE Lawrence Piersol

- 1) **"COMMON LAW 'WRIT OF ERROR CORAM NOBIS' IN OPPOSITION TO PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE OF 'CRIMINAL FRAUD AND CONSPIRACY TO DEPRIVE OF RIGHTS' INVOLVING 'JUDICIAL USURPERS' AND 'CLERKS OF THE COURTS' AS 'AGENTS' OF THE NAMED 'CO-TRUSTEES' OF THE CASE CAPTIONED ABOVE';**
- 2) **"FINDING OF CONTEMPT" AND "CERTIFICATION OF FAULT/DEFAULT WITH 'DEFAULT JUDGMENT' AND COMMON LAW 'LEDGER OF [TREBLE] DAMAGES'";**
- 3) **"NOTICE OF 'CLAIM OF APPEAL' FOR THE REASONS CITED ABOVE AND BASED UPON 'OVERRIDING AND PALPABLE ERRORS' AND GROSS OMISSIONS OF FACTS; AND INTENTIONAL [TORTUOUS] VIOLATIONS OF THE 'RULES ENABLING ACT'"**

...as located publicly at the following link since the lower court "clerk" (Matthew Thelen) has failed to provide any date-stamped copies of these documents after acknowledging his receipt of this and other specific documents (i.e., all of which remain SEALED in the "first case") filed to the USDC's own record.

[http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/080821\\_CORAMNOBISDefaultNoticeofAppeal.pdf](http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/080821_CORAMNOBISDefaultNoticeofAppeal.pdf)

NOTE ALSO: Since Beneficiary was never given ANY "*access*" to the electronic record and numbered pages of documents by the "*lower court*" in either case, his only determination of proper page designation is by reference to his own

The Secretary of State's office and the FBI's website define "*domestic terrorism*" as in accordance with 18 U.S.C. § 2331 and 31 CFR 594.311 which state the following: the term "*domestic terrorism*" means activities that —

- (A) involve acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State;
- (B) appear to be intended—
  - (i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population;
  - (ii) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or
  - (iii) to affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping; and
- (C) occur primarily within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

18 U.S.C. § 2331. The term *terrorism* means an activity that:

- a) Involves a violent act or an act dangerous to human life, property, or infrastructure; and
- b) Appears to be intended:
  - 1) To intimidate or coerce a civilian population;
  - 2) To influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or

In this instant "*second*" case, Piersol went so far as to fraudulently state that somehow – in spite of Beneficiary clearly naming up to twenty (20) DOES in this case and detailing the tortuous actions of "U HAUL Agents #1-16" with page numbers in his TABLE OF CONTENTS, that some he "*finds*" (somehow) while wearing virtual "*blind*ers" to "*obstruct*" justice and his use of common sense (as shown below) – that Beneficiary "*does not allege any facts against*" DOES #1-

20. See the final paragraph of Piersol's

## FRAUDULENT ORDER



Schied cannot rely on mere labels and conclusions to support these claims. *Torti*, 868 F.3d at 671. This Court finds that Schied's entire Complaint is frivolous. He names Does #1-20 as a defendant but does not allege any facts against this entity. \*9

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

- 1. That Schied's Complaint is dismissed as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i-ii).

"ORIGINAL" filings and page numbers, which he has uploaded to the Internet with full access to the public for these two cases in his own ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD for this case, established under the authority of the Sovereign People under the COMMON LAW, as located at:

[http://www.ricobusters.com/?page\\_id=345](http://www.ricobusters.com/?page_id=345)

**OPENING SUMMARY ABOUT THE LOWER COURTS'  
FRAUDULENT DISMISSALS OF NOT JUST ONE, BUT TWO (2) CASES  
NEAR SIMULTANEOUSLY**

Significant to the proper review of this case "*dismissal*" is the FACT that from the onset of being provided with the DOCKETING SHEET for the "*first case*" Beneficiary had filed his "OBJECTION TO SEALING OF CASE and MOTION TO SHOW CAUSE" listing numerous aspects of the UNITED STATES' (i.e., the "*Clerk of the Court's*") own "*Court of Record*" as fraudulently constructed.<sup>9</sup> Such fraudulence in the construction of that DOCKETING RECORD clearly was duplicated by unauthorized "*pattern and practice*" in "*setting up*" this "*second case*" for the "Big Fall" (i.e., "Summary Dismissal").

Having every opportunity to address these *factual challenges* to these "*administrative*" (i.e., not "*judicial*") manners in which "**Clerk**" Thelen nevertheless maintained his mischaracterization of Beneficiary's actual "*status*" – IN BOTH CASES – as was originally "*presented*" (as opposed to being "**REpresented**") to this court with a JURY DEMAND – **whereas the clerk's "Docket Sheet" also fraudulently reflected "Jury Demand: NONE"** in the "*first case*".

---

<sup>9</sup> This document is posted public in Beneficiary's own ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD as located at:

[http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/060421\\_ObjectionShowCauseDemand4SpecGJInvestig-ALL-1.pdf](http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/060421_ObjectionShowCauseDemand4SpecGJInvestig-ALL-1.pdf)

| U.S. District Court<br>District of South Dakota (Western Division)<br>DOCKET FOR CASE #: 5:21-cv-05030-LLP *SEALED* |                                                         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| of America                                                                                                          | Date Filed: 05/07/2021                                  |
| et Judge Lawrence L. Piersol                                                                                        | Jury Demand: None                                       |
| 1 False Claims Act                                                                                                  | Nature of Suit: 375 Other Statutes: False<br>Claims Act |
|                                                                                                                     | Jurisdiction: Federal Question                          |

While listing Beneficiary as a civil "*Plaintiff*" instead of a common law "*Grievant/Claimant/Crime Victim/Beneficiary*", Thelen had also listed Beneficiary as acting "*pro se*" when the ORIGINAL COMPLAINT and other "*original*" filings had specifically delineated David Schied as acting with a status of a "*sui juris*" litigant. <sup>10</sup> See 28 U.S.C. § 1654.

| U.S. District Court<br>District of South Dakota (Western Division)<br>CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 5:21-cv-05035-JLV                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Schied v. U-Haul International, Inc. et al<br>Assigned to: U.S. District Judge Jeffrey L. Viken<br>Cause: 42:1983 Civil Rights Act - Civil Action for<br>Deprivation of Rights                                                                        | Date Filed: 06/22/2021<br>Jury Demand: Plaintiff<br>Nature of Suit: 446 Civil Rights:<br>Americans with Disabilities - Other<br>Jurisdiction: Federal Question |
| <b>Plaintiff</b><br><b>David Schied</b><br><i>one of the Sovereign American People;<br/>a totally and permanently disabled<br/>RECENT QUAD-AMPUTEE; CRIME<br/>VICTIM; Common Law and Civil<br/>Rights sui juris GRIEVANT/CLAIMANT<br/>BENEFICIARY</i> | represented by <b>David Schied</b><br>PO Box 321<br>Spearfish, SD 57783<br>Email: deschied@yahoo.com<br><b>PRO SE</b>                                          |
| V.<br><b>Defendant</b><br>U-Haul International, Inc.<br><b>Defendant</b><br>Does #1-20                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                |

<sup>10</sup> See the graphic below as a third-party clarification as to the difference between "*pro se*" and "*sui juris*". See also again, the graphic on page 5 herein showing that Beneficiary not only filed this (as well as the other) case with a "**Jury Demand**", but also a "**Demand for Criminal Grand Jury Investigation**" for each case.



1. What is the difference between Sui Juris and Pro Se?

Here is the UNPROFESSIONAL version.. Sui Juris is I am your MASTER (you are the public servant SLAVE) Pro Se, Is THEY are going to bend you over and screw you hard cause you don't have an attorney!

<http://www.avoiceforchildren.com/books/suijuris.html>

<http://www.rumormillnews.com/cgi-bin/archive.cgi?read=69922>

Never APPEAR 'Pro se', 'Pro per' or 'Pro' anything, not even 'In propria persona'. Never allow the Black Robed Devil to proclaim that you are there 'Pro se', 'Pro per' or 'Pro' anything. Always, ALWAYS, take EXCEPTION. One does not OBJECT to the Judge's utterances, one takes EXCEPTION. One OBJECTS to the Prosecutor's utterances.

The Supreme Court in all of its ultimate wisdom made this ruling about those who APPEAR 'PRO SE': "If there is any truth to the old proverb that '[o]ne who is his own lawyer has a fool for a client,' the Court by its opinion today now bestows a constitutional right on one to make a fool of himself." -- *Faretta v California*, 45 L Ed 2d 562, 592 (1975); also, found at last page of 422 US 806 and 95 S Ct 2525. To become a good belligerent claimant one needs to learn the "Faretta Defense".

Additionally, Thelen misrepresented "*The Accused*" as civil "*Defendants*" instead of "CO-TRUSTEES" as otherwise named by Beneficiary in both their individual and "*official*" capacities, **so to ensure that – particularly in the “first case” – “immunity” is applied ONLY to the instances where the JURY decides that the acts committed by “*The Accused*” (calling themselves “government officials”) were indeed executed within the “*enunciated*” confines of constitutional authority “*delegated*” by the Sovereign People as any “office duty”.**

In fact, as shown graphicly to this EIGHTH CIRCUIT COA in BOTH cases, Beneficiary had constructed BOTH of his “*ORIGINAL COMPLAINT(s)*” with just such a “DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL” to ensure and that all acts alleged to have been committed would be determined by the JURY “*according to the rules of common law*”; being also known to be similar in certain standards as the “rules” for



adjudicating the “merits” of cases using “Trust Law”. <sup>11</sup> This was particularly appropriate for the “first case”, which was filed as a “WHISTLEBLOWER” case given that the U.S. government was founded under a “PUBLIC TRUST” and the U.S.

<sup>11</sup> On 8/25/16, Beneficiary had submitted his date-stamped scholarly research on this topic of TRUST LAW to the USDC for the EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN and to the SIXTH CIRCUIT COA. Although neither “federal court” dared to acknowledge this scholarly legal research, much less address its merits, this “MEMORANDUM ON RIGHTS OF (WE), ‘THE PEOPLE’” states, “The constitutions of the States and the United States of America were originally designed as a ‘Public Trust’ document, establishing fiduciary obligations of ‘Trustees’ toward the ‘Trust Beneficiaries,’ with certain penalties for breaches of duties for public “servants” constituting crimes of Treason against both the people and the States”. **This “original” reference EXHIBIT is posted in its entirety at the following Internet location as a matter of Beneficiary/Relator’s COMMON LAW COURT OF RECORD:**

[http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/MemorandumofPeoplesRights\\_KhalilCase.pdf](http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/MemorandumofPeoplesRights_KhalilCase.pdf)

**DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES <sup>1</sup>**

**(FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, SOUTHERN DIVISION)**

David Schied and Cornell Squires,  
*Sui Juris Grievants/Private Attorney Generals*  
v.  
Karen Khalil, et al

Case No. 2:15-cv-11840  
Judge: Avern Cohn

*Defendants* /

**Under the Common Law Guarantee (7<sup>th</sup> Amendment)**  
**Of an Article III Court of Record**



**“MEMORANDUM ON RIGHTS OF (WE), ‘THE PEOPLE’:**

**TO ASSEMBLE; TO LOCAL GOVERNANCE; AND TO WITHDRAW ‘CONSENT’  
THROUGH STATE AND FEDERAL JURY NULLIFICATION, THROUGH GRAND  
JURY PRESENTMENTS, THROUGH PRIVATE PROSECUTIONS, AND THROUGH  
OTHER EXECUTIONS OF CUSTOMARY LAW AND THE LAWS OF COMMERCE’**

In Evidence and Support of Acts of Self-Defense, and Responses to the Unconstitutional  
Denial of First Amendment Right to Redress of Grievances Regarding  
Previous “Backward-Looking-Access-to-Court” Claims

CONSTITUTION was founded as a "*TRUST*" contract (or "*Compact*") between the "*Masters*" (i.e., the Sovereign People as both "*Trustors*" and "*Beneficiaries*") and the "*Servants*" – i.e., the government officials as "*Trustees*" subject to penalties and criminal prosecution for their dereliction, gross negligence, and malfeasance in mishandling the Peoples' "trusted" enunciated and delegated powers and authorities.

Nevertheless, these agent provocateurs of the UNITED STATES instead did the same as all others of "*The Accused*" in that "*first case*", by first acquiescing and remaining ("affirmatively") completely silent and in TACIT AGREEMENT about these FACTUAL CLAIMS, before then turning around Seditiously and Treasonously to create a fraudulent USDC "*court record*" GROSSLY OMITTING and/or MISCHARACTERIZING Beneficiary's significant "*objection*" details that were summarily denied any "*reasonable*" address as a matter of that – what Beneficiary deems as his own more accurate and truthfully revealing "ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD".

These above-described DECEPTIVE "*facts*" were established based upon Beneficiary's simultaneous challenge against the unexplained "*SEALING*" of that very same "*court record*" <sup>12</sup> – which remains "sealed" through today – that resultingly has been undermining both the *letter* and the *spirit* of the laws governing

---

<sup>12</sup> Supra. See the above reference to Beneficiary's "OBJECTION TO SEALING OF CASE and MOTION TO SHOW CAUSE" and Footnote #9.

the purpose for filing Federal "*WHISTLEBLOWER*" cases in the first place, being to report GOVERNMENT FRAUD, being ultimately against the "Sovereign", the American "taxpayers".

Theoretically, Whistleblower Cases are supposed to be "unsealed" once the CO-TRUSTEES of the USDOJ have decided either to manage the case (which herein is against THEMSELVES as the named "*CO-TRUSTEES*") or to allow the private individual to do their work instead <sup>13</sup>, to the best of his or her "faithful" duty to the "Sovereign".

Either way, that "*first [whistleblower] case*" was supposed to be "*litigated on the merits*" IN THE PUBLIC VIEW, something that the American population is currently being barred from by this lower court "*judge*" Piersol. <sup>14</sup>

Altogether, what is described above is really a microcosm for the alleged "*pattern of practice*" of the other CO-TRUSTEES named in the "*first case*" as "*The Accused*" who have acted similarly in the past to "*affirmatively*" acquiesce in "*tacit*

---

<sup>13</sup> See p.7 of the document published by the FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER titled, *Sealing Court Records and Proceedings: A Pocket Guide*, posted at: (link next page) [http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Sealing-Court-Records-and-Proceedings -A-Pocket-Guide.pdf](http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Sealing-Court-Records-and-Proceedings-A-Pocket-Guide.pdf)

<sup>14</sup> Piersol is herein being named now in BOTH that "*first case*" and this "*second*" case – along with his supervisory "*Chief Judge*" Roberto Lange – as agent(s) for "*The Accused*" CO-TRUSTEES, being *principals* acting on the behalf of the "UNITED STATES, et alia" and "U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, INC. et alia" to further obfuscate and obstruct justice. Again, "Justice delayed is Justice denied".

agreement" with Beneficiary's many previous "*original complaints*".<sup>15</sup> **These are *public officers* who only then later – when Beneficiary escalated his complaints using his FIRST AMENDMENT "*Right to Redress Grievances*" – continued to rely upon their “government” co-conspirators to do their “tag-team” takeover of the situation by addressing these escalated matter(s) through “FRAUD BY OMISSIONS” and “MISSTATEMENTS OF FACTS”, usually always submitted by BAR members.**

This is a SYSTEMIC pattern and practice – instituted BY DESIGN – that has been demonstrated repeatedly at the STATE and UNITED STATES levels in both “chain” and “wheel” conspiracy patterns; **being again demonstrated in BOTH the “first case” and in this instant case by both Piersol and Thelen** (along with the “affirmative” complacency of “chief judge oversight” by Roberto Lange), while acting OUTSIDE of their official DUTIES and OATHS, on the *UNITED STATES'* behalf as the named principals steering this case on behalf of the CO-TRUSTEES.

---

<sup>15</sup> These “*original complaints*” have been in the form of both “*civil court*” complaints submitted to “*judges*” and “*criminal complaints*” submitted to “*law enforcement*” and “*prosecutors*” – with all governing *decisionmakers* being connective and “*co-conspiring*” members of multi-faceted and multi-tiered STATE and “*AMERICAN*” BAR organizations carrying on in RICO fashion to hold a MONOPOLY over the UNITED STATES “*judicial*” system; and, in fact, over ALL THREE BRANCHES of American *civil* and *criminal* governance.

The above point has been more recently exemplified by the EIGHTH CIRCUIT Clerk, Michael Gans, in his correspondence dated 8/23/21 whereby he detailed the “Addresses For [the] Case Participants” by listing ONLY “Mr. David Schied” and “Mr. Matthew W. Thelen” (**without Thelen’s “official” status applied** as shown below by exact photocopy).

| Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals                                                                                         |                                                                                                                         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| PRO SE Notice of Docket Activity                                                                                        |                                                                                                                         |
| The following was filed on 08/23/2021                                                                                   |                                                                                                                         |
| <b>Addresses For Case Participants: 21-2873</b>                                                                         | Case Name: David Schied v. U-Haul International, Inc., et al<br>Case Number: 21-2873                                    |
| Mr. David Schied<br>P.O. Box 321<br>Spearfish, SD 57783                                                                 | Docket Text:<br>Civil case docketed. [5068039] [21-2873]                                                                |
| Mr. Matthew W. Thelen<br>U.S. DISTRICT COURT<br>District of South Dakota<br>302 U.S. Courthouse<br>Rapid City, SD 57701 | The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:<br>Document Description: Notice of Appeal Docket Letter |
|                                                                                                                         | Notice will be mailed to:                                                                                               |
|                                                                                                                         | Notice will be electronically mailed to:                                                                                |
|                                                                                                                         | Mr. David Schied: deschied@yahoo.com<br>Mr. Matthew W. Thelen: coadocs@sdd.uscourts.gov                                 |
| Appellate Case: 21-2873 Page: 3 Date Filed: 08/23/2021 Entry ID: 5068039                                                |                                                                                                                         |

In fact, it appears that the two “*clerks of the [two] courts*” of the CO-TRUSTEES “*District Court*” and the “*Court of Appeals*” have indeed placed Beneficiary’s case on the “*EXPRESS*” train for yet another potential tier of RICO “*railroading*” via the next higher layer of “*whitewashing*” over what the lower court “*judge*” Piersol has already done. That very day of 8/23/21, “*Clerk Gans*” wrote a cover letter revealing that the EIGHTH CIRCUIT had already received the “*lower court record*” electronically, and that – in spite of the FEDERAL RULES OF

APPELLATE PROCEDURE (“FRAP”), Rule #31(a)(1) stating that “*The appellant **must** serve and **file a brief** within 40 days after the record is filed*” – Michael Gans has shown the propensity to convince Beneficiary that such a transference of the lower court file otherwise precludes Beneficiary’s appellate Right, as well as Beneficiary’s “*Claim of Right*”, to file the above referenced “*Brief*” at all!

As shown by the link directly below to Beneficiary’s open, transparent, and public COMMON LAW COURT OF RECORD, Michael Gans sent through the “*snail mail*” the following statement to Beneficiary:

*“The case has been referred to the court for initial review and no briefing schedule has been set. You do not need to file any additional documents or pleadings at this time. We will advise you of any action taken in this case.”*

[http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/082321\\_U-HAULCase21-2873\\_2ppcovrletrDocketreceivednoneed2file.pdf](http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/082321_U-HAULCase21-2873_2ppcovrletrDocketreceivednoneed2file.pdf)

Again, this is a clear demonstration of how each multi-tiered level of “*Redress*” for the Sovereign American People gets short-circuited and undermined by the “*pattern and practice*” of BAR-member principals and their *agents* abusing their “trusted” discretion to use “*PROCEDURE OVER SUBSTANCE*”.

In other words, these “*judges*” of the higher courts and their associated “*clerks*” find such ways to circumvent the rules using “*misleading*” statements and outright *fraud* in the procedural railroading of cases. They do this **to steal away the substantive sovereign Rights of We, The People; or at least to fool**

unsuspecting “*litigants*” into believing that these court “*fiduciaries*” are actually carrying out their DUTIES constitutionally in accordance with their OATHS and DUTIES of “*offices*”, when they actually are NOT doing so transparently.

In this case, “*Clerk Gans*” is obviously hoping that Beneficiary David Schied will follow the “*advisement*” <sup>16</sup> of what Gans wrote in the mail, and “*voluntarily*” give up his “*procedural*” Right = both to file this instant “BRIEF ON CLAIM IN APPEAL” and to ignore the “FRAP RULE #31(a)(1)” himself – which would put the nefarious agents of the CO-TRUSTEES at a prejudicial advantage in being able to claim that Beneficiary “*failed to file an appeal brief*” in accordance with the “*appellate rules*”; and that, conversely, the “*Clerk Michael Gans*” never actually told Beneficiary NOT to file additional “*pleadings*”, but instead only “*advised*” that “*additional pleadings are [NOT] required*”. <sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Note here, the pattern and practice of the “*Office of the Clerk*” at both the STATE and UNITED STATES courts – when procedural questions come from “*pro se*” or other litigants without attorney representation – is to inform these sovereign American People that the clerk’s office “cannot and does not provide legal advice”. However, as shown herein, **when the people operating these “*clerks*” offices find it convenient to them for confusing sovereign Americans (i.e., those who cannot afford or do not want attorney “*representation*”), they seemingly have no problem in providing such “*advisement*” as is demonstrated herein.**

<sup>17</sup> In fact, Gan had also sent conflicting documentation of a “Notice to Pro Se Litigants Regarding Service of Their Documents” and a “Certificate of Service for Pro Se Documents” – **without explanation** – to emphasize the FACT that this clerk’s written message is NOT to be misinterpreted to mean that the underlying “*FRAP Rules*” still do not apply. This, again, is nothing but a simple tool that has been deceptively used – among many others on a gray scale to extreme fraudulence – by the STATES and UNITED STATES “*courts*” to ensure that the MONOPOLY



The undermining difference herein, is in the “[black] *art of the language*” used by the clerk to create such a misunderstanding that allows the clerk and the “*court*” to absolve all responsibility and accountability for potential misunderstandings about “*procedure*”.<sup>18</sup>

In carrying on this way, **the CO-TRUSTEES of this instant case, inclusive of Piersol, Lange, and Thelen** – who, throughout this case, have been acting *outside* of their “*FIDUCIARY*” capacities and in *violation* of their OATHS and *trusted* DUTIES of offices as “*judiciaries*” and “*functionary*”, to *deny access* of Beneficiary to *their* U.S. DISTRICT COURT – **have once again exhibited the very types of acts described as matters of FACTS throughout the "ORIGINAL COMPLAINT" in the “first case”, being about all of the other STATE and FEDERAL "actors" named as CO-TRUSTEES in that other still "sealed" case.**

Moreover, in carrying on this way, “*CO-TRUSTEES*”, UNITED STATES’ acting “*principals*” Lange and Piersol, and acting “*agent*” Thelen (and now perhaps

---

on “*People’s*” courts of America stays with these BAR attorneys, judicial usurpers, and their respective *agents*. In this case, what Michael Gans has communicated is intentionally as “*clear as mud*”.

<sup>18</sup> BAR attorneys are especially well versed in the illicit use of *word plasticity* to “*stretch*” words and word meanings to gain the superior advantage over a legal opponent using the five domains of English Language, being phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics. This is particularly true when using *pragmatics* with *logic* as tools of *persuasion* when presenting legal discourse.

Gans), are also exemplifying the manner in which their individual acts constitute additions to the "*chain*" and "*wheel*" conspiracies discussed openly in the ORIGINAL COMPLAINT of the "*first* [inextricably intertwined] *case*", though conspicuously avoided, if not entirely OMITTED by Piersol ... that is, except for the single word "*conspiracy*" <sup>19</sup>, which was placed by Piersol out of proper factual context, **so as to colorfully paint his otherwise *invalid* fraudulent FINAL RECORD over the TRUTH IN FACTS about this very important and valid NATIONAL SECURITY matter.**

Such ABUSES OF DISCRETION are wrongly meant to portray Beneficiary as being either technically "*inadequate*" when standing up for his own Rights as a "*Sovereign*" without a "*representative*" BAR-card-carrying attorney to do his bidding for him; or to portray him otherwise as some type of "*conspiracy theorist*" without personal and professional integrity. This double-edged sword then is applied

---

<sup>19</sup> Importantly, on the "*cover sheet*" face of his ORIGINAL COMPLAINT and virtually all other significant filings in the lower court for the "*first case*", Beneficiary David Schied had published his documents with the following: "*On Case Involving 'Backward Looking' CONSTITUTIONAL and COMMON LAW TORTS Inextricably Intertwined in Compound 'Wheel' and 'Chain' Conspiracies Against Totally and Permanently Disabled Quad-Amputee and Other Sovereign American People, as 'BENEFICIARIES' of the PUBLIC TRUST(s), Who Have Been Similarly Situated in Being the Victims of Insurrection and Domestic Terrorism by 'Government Imposters' and 'Usurpers of the Sovereign Peoples' Power'*". [See the links provided in that "*other*" (now herein fully incorporated) case to Beneficiary's own "*unsealed*", and fully transparent to the public, ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD for that case.]

against Beneficiary simply because he is asserting rightful challenges against these above-described **patterns and practices of BAR member attorney and judges** <sup>20</sup>, by way of using his equally rightful constitutional guarantees as a Sovereign American. <sup>21</sup>

Acts such as these by Lange, Piersol and Thelen, create significant DAMAGES by a falsified public portrayal of Beneficiary, rather than TRUTHFULLY shedding light on David Schied as being the fact-based researcher and meticulously organized "*scribe*" that he otherwise has proven himself to be as one of many Sovereign American People with personal and professional integrity. <sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> See a full listing (8 pages) of the "[CORRUPT] **PATTERN AND PRACTICE OF STATE AND NATIONAL JUDICIARIES**" at: (*see bottom of next page*) <http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/PatternPractofStateNatJudiciaries.pdf>

<sup>21</sup> The institutionalization of this type of behavior by attorneys and judges is what society is now recognizing as "*Cancel Culture*"; with the implementation being used regularly against any and all perceived "*ordinary*" people who either cannot afford expensive attorney "*retainers*" or who otherwise can see through their law firm "*crime syndicates*" and their so-called "*courts*" as "*continuing financial crimes enterprises*" and "*cut their losses*" without feeding more "*profits*" to these seditious and treasonous CORPORATE "*monsters*" as "*officers of the court*".

<sup>22</sup> In spite of the *fraudulent* and *defamatory* EVIDENCE still published by some of "*The Accused*" CO-TRUSTEES (as "*judicial usurpers*" named by the "*first case*") of the STATE OF MICHIGAN and the UNITED STATES in a long line of previous Seditious and Treasonous "*abuses of discretion*" in the region of America overseen by the SIXTH CIRCUIT, CO-TRUSTEES continue to disregard the FACT that Beneficiary is a skilled, Ph.D. level researcher scholar that has graduated (*cum laude*) with dual-BA degrees [Cinema-Television production; East Asian (Japanese) Language and Culture] from the prestigious UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA (USC); and with a MASTER'S degree from another top-tier research university of UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN (U-M).

Thus, within two days of Piersol's *dismissal* of that "*first case*" against the "*UNITED STATES, et al*", "*chief judge*" Roberto Lange issued an ORDER for the unexplained transfer of this instant "*other*" case that was filed by David Schied in his private capacity as "*Beneficiary*", which involved a "*new incidence or occurrence*" as detailed about the ("*DOES 1-20*") agents of "*principal*" U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, INC.

**The underlying basis of this instant (previously unrelated) case was that the TORT and DAMAGES occurred while BENEFICIARY was living within the metes and bounds of South Dakota.** As shown already, this "*David Schied v. U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, et al*" case was "*reassigned*" by Roberto Lange from its "*original judge*", Jeffrey Viken, to Lawrence Piersol; so that Piersol would apply the same type of *abusive mishandling and dismissal* to the "*David Schied v. U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, et al*" case that Piersol had just finished applying in that "*other*"

---

Such spite of CO-TRUSTEES has shown itself perpetually ignoring numerous written reminders over the past nearly two decades that **Beneficiary is also a published author of two books on home security and personal protection; a *bona fide* crime victims' rights activist [having served as a Founding Board member next to Doris Tate in the 1980s with the COALITION ON VICTIMS' EQUAL RIGHTS (C.O.V.E.R.), and a documentary filmmaker who has been – for this past decade and a half – exposing government corruption by videotaping the personal, firsthand testimonials and presenting the unrebutted EVIDENCE of other CRIME VICTIMS against government *imposters*, judicial *usurpers*, *insurrectionists*, and *domestic terrorists* who are committing TREASON against *We, The People*, as sovereign Americans.**

[now “*inextricably intertwined*”] case” of “*David Schied v. UNITED STATES, et al*”.

Now, BOTH cases are on “*appeal*” with similar lower court histories, whereby each case was “*dismissed*” on the behalf of the Beneficiary David Schied’s lawful court opponent – while leaving those opponents without their even being placed on notice about being “sued” in the first place by forma pauperis and totally and permanently disabled quad-amputee. This all occurred simply because Lange, Piersol and Thelen had criminally “obstructed” BOTH cases, by acting unilaterally on U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL INC.’s behalf in this case – and leaving Beneficiary in both cases without meaningful access to this UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT. <sup>23</sup>

Notably, each of these two case actions are *similarly* both constitutional violations and both federal felonies committed “*under color of law*”.

---

<sup>23</sup> These two cases – which are connected together by the “*act of Bad Behavior*” (i.e., which was yet “*legal act done in an illegal manner*” done under “*color of*” law and/or other authority) of Roberto Lange, and by Piersol and Thelen in railroading both cases – makes these two cases, now and forever after, “*inextricably intertwined*”.

### **“Inextricably intertwined” evidence**

#### **Definition**

Evidence of other acts that is admissible because it is either (1) evidence that forms part of the transaction that serves as the basis for the criminal charge; or (2) evidence necessary for the prosecution to offer a coherent narrative regarding the commission of the crime.

See also, Jaime L. Padgett, *How Less Is More: The Unraveling of the Inextricable Intertwinement Doctrine Under United States v. Gorman*, 6 SEVENTH CIRCUIT REV. 196 (2010), at <http://www.kentlaw.edu/7cr/v6-1/padgett.pdf>

SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION FOR THE “EIGHTH CIRCUIT”  
AS WELL AS FOR “WE, THE PEOPLE”

As such, “*subject matter jurisdiction*” for this EIGHTH CIRCUIT is found in all of this “*superior*” court’s authority for review of “*final*” decisions and “*judgments*” of the lower federal court subordinates. This would include a thorough “*de novo*” review of the above SUMMARY OF FACTS about Piersol’s collaboration with Thelen and Lange on what appears to be the “*permanent sealing*” of the “*first case*” and the “*dismissal*” of both cases by the SAME comedic *actors* (Piersol and Thelen) under virtually IDENTICAL *fraudulent* pretenses...so to SIMILARLY deprive Beneficiary, as a *totally and permanently disabled quad-amputee*, of his rights as a *whistleblower* against STATE and UNITED STATES imposters and FASCIST-type CORPORATIONS.

In such way, these two, *principal* and *agent* <sup>24</sup> have conspired with Roberto Lange as altogether being *insurrectionists* and *domestic terrorists* that have infiltrated the CONSTITUTIONAL REPUBLIC otherwise set up by the **Sovereign** (People) of the United States of America *for* the same as “*Beneficiaries*”, being the national communit(ies) of “*We, The* [Sovereign American] *People*”.

---

<sup>24</sup> When placed into the context of the broader scale and larger perspective, Lange, Piersol, and Thelen are the “*agents*” of the “*principal*” of other supervisory criminals running the UNITED STATES from a top-down hierarchy through a Fascist-Socialist-Communist dictatorship rather than as a Constitutional and Democratic Republic that the People are otherwise “*sealed*” against knowing the TRUTH about having lost long ago.

Such “*subject matter jurisdiction*” would also include, but not be limited in scope, to a possible “*En Banc*” review of the reported (as supported by EVIDENCE) “*bad behavior*” of these U.S. DISTRICT COURT (“USDC”) “*judges*” operating in the WESTERN DIVISION OF SOUTH DAKOTA; as well as of other reported judges named as CO-TRUSTEES in this case residing elsewhere in the UNITED STATES, who are – as detailed in Beneficiary’s **documents submitted to the lower court in the “first case” and incorporated herein by reference** – *judicial usurpers* acting also as “*senior judges*” and “*chief judges*” operating in the USDC for the EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN.

Notably, Beneficiary’s “**BRIEF ON CLAIM AND APPEAL**” in that “*first case*” of “*Schied v. UNITED STATES, et alia*” is incorporated herein as if written verbatim; along with all of its near two-decades (even longer) of meticulously documentary EVIDENCE, as posted ONLINE in Beneficiary’s own ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD to maintain the integrity of the FACTS about “*rogue judges*” who are SEDITIOUSLY and TREASONOUSLY “*legislating from the bench*” <sup>25</sup> – with

---

<sup>25</sup> See the “**FACTUAL**” **EXHIBITS #1-8** submitted to SCOTUS in 2011 – and the “*Extraordinary Circumstances as Grounds for Relief*” submitted to SCOTUS on page 15 of the downloadable PDF – as also individually listed in the “*Appendix of Referenced Exhibits*” (page 33 of that PDF); and provided therein afterwards through the end of this downloadable document containing numerous “*Judicial Misconduct*” and “*Attorney Grievance*” complaints **submitted by verifiable, signed sworn and notarized statements that have NEVER been rebutted**, as collectively posted at: <http://www.ricobusters.com/wp->



Beneficiary working also as “*Relator*” and “*Private, Public Proxy*”, constitutionally and on behalf of the Sovereign American People under the inalienable “*Right to Redress*”, to resolve these important National Problems of INSURRECTION and DOMESTIC TERRORISM.

### COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION

From the moment of the actual FIRST “*filing*” of his “*first case*” on 4/22/21 – by mail because the USDCSDWD was refusing to accept in-person filings from the Sovereign American People (citing “*COVID*” reasons) and awarding preferential treatment to fellow BAR members of the unauthorized and unconstitutional MONOPOLY on the U.S. “*court*” system – a RECORD was established by Beneficiary David Schied regarding the “*bad behavior*” of the Clerk of the Court, Matthew Thelen, and his *agents*.

This is a record that has been incorporated into the CO-TRUSTEES’ own “*court*” and/or federal “*docketing*” records which reflect false data generated by “*the court*” – which conspicuously omits what was fervently “*objected to*” by “Beneficiary/Relator”, but yet gross negligently avoided any address by Piersol – as would be required of any *legitimate* ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD. These

---

<content/uploads/2021/08/STATENationalJudicialMisconductComplaint-allddenied.pdf>

records are located in Beneficiary's COMMON LAW (ARTICLE III) COURT (OF RECORD) at: [http://www.ricobusters.com/?page\\_id=342](http://www.ricobusters.com/?page_id=342)

These records – conspicuously marked by Thelen as Dkt Items #2 and #3 and #4 in the lower “*USDC record*” – were labeled according to the USDC’s “*Docket Sheet*” by someone with the private initials of “SKK”. **These records were entered gross negligently up to THREE WEEKS after being “received” by the CO-TRUSTEES’ “Office of the Clerk” and with the name of Beneficiary spelled falsely as a matter of the “lower court record”:** <sup>26</sup>


| Date Filed | #        | Docket Text                                                                                         |
|------------|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 05/07/2021 | <u>1</u> | COMPLAINT filed by David <u>Schied.</u> (SKK) (Entered: <u>05/11/2021</u> )                         |
| 05/07/2021 | <u>2</u> | LETTER dated 5-5-21 Received from David <u>Shied</u> to Clerk. (SKK) (Entered: <u>05/12/2021</u> )  |
| 05/07/2021 | <u>3</u> | LETTER dated 4-30-21 Received from David <u>Shied</u> to Clerk. (SKK) (Entered: <u>05/12/2021</u> ) |
| 05/07/2021 | <u>4</u> | LETTER dated 4-21-21 Received from David <u>Shied</u> to Clerk. (SKK) (Entered: <u>05/12/2021</u> ) |

<sup>26</sup> Dkt Item #4 – [http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/1-042121\\_CoverLetr2ClerkoftheCourt.pdf](http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/1-042121_CoverLetr2ClerkoftheCourt.pdf)

Dkt Item #3 – [http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/043021\\_LetrofAllegationsAgainstClerkThelenLudem.pdf](http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/043021_LetrofAllegationsAgainstClerkThelenLudem.pdf)

Dkt Item #2 – [http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/050521\\_CvrLetr2ThelenonResendPkgBillingFeeSchedule.pdf](http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/050521_CvrLetr2ThelenonResendPkgBillingFeeSchedule.pdf)

In this instant case of Schied v. U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, INC. – being inconsistent with the manner in which Thelen and his “*clerk agents*” designated separate “Document [WHOLE] Numbers” to these “*instructional cover letters to the Clerk*” fraudulently as “*case documents*” submitted to the Clerk for “*case filing*” – Matthew Thelen and his unnamed agents instead entered Beneficiary’s “*instructional cover letter to the Clerk*” as a “Document [PARENTHETICAL] Number”; which was entered the very next day into the USDC record by someone with the initials “SAC”.



| Date Filed | #                     | Docket Text                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 06/22/2021 | <u>1</u>              | COMPLAINT. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Cover Letter with Bill for Costs) (SAC) (Entered: 06/23/2021)                                                                                                               |
| 06/22/2021 | <del>1</del> <u>2</u> | MOTION for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis (Short Form) by David Schied. (SAC) (Entered: 06/23/2021)                                                                                                         |
| 06/22/2021 | <del>1</del> <u>3</u> | BENEFICIARY'S MOTION TO PROCEED IN DISTRICT COURT WITHOUT PREPAYING FEES OR COSTS; WITH ACCOMPANYING COMPLETED "APPLICATION" FOR THE SAME by David Schied. (SAC) (Entered: 06/23/2021)                          |
| 06/22/2021 | <del>1</del> <u>4</u> | BENEFICIARY'S MOTION FOR CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE OF SUBPOENA AND COMPLAINT BY U.S. MARSHAL WITHOUT PREPAYING FEES OR COSTS by David Schied. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> USM-285 Form) (SAC) (Entered: 06/23/2021) |

Clearly, as referenced by Piersol’s fraudulent “Memorandum/Opinion /Order” from the “*first case*”, **Beneficiary has had a long history of dealing with the corrupted U.S. DISTRICT COURT(s) in the EDM and SIXTH CIRCUIT, and NEVER has the “*cover letter(s) to the clerk in request for proper filing*” been added to the Docketing Record. Therefore, Beneficiary challenges the referenced CO-TRUSTEES “*in charge*” of this record to prove that they have**

done the same (in either of these two demonstrated fashions) with other litigants who have filed, such as those filing: a) *forma pauperis*; b) as a disabled person treated in the “*spirit*” of the AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT; c) as an attorney “*representing*” any other party whatsoever.

It is thus, a FACTUAL contention that the filing of these above four “*cover letters*” by the *Clerk of the Court* is indicative of a “*conspiracy to obstruct justice*” by the latest in a long line of CO-TRUSTEES as agents and principals of the “UNITED STATES”; executed criminally via obfuscating the “*official*” records of BOTH of Beneficiary’s *ORIGINAL COMPLAINT(s)*, by this “*clerk*” also using an electronic “*wink and nod*” of communication to this politically LEFTIST “*insurrectionist senior judge*” and former “*chief judge*” appointed by Bill Clinton – “Larry” Piersol – that *railroaded* these two now “*inextricably intertwined*” cases.

by consumers, for consumers...

## Ripoff Report®

Don't let them get away with it!® Let the truth be known!™

Report: #137001

### Complaint Review: Lawrence L. Piersol, Chief United States District Judge - Sioux Falls South Dakota

■ Lawrence L. Piersol, Chief United States District Judge  
Rm 202 United States Courthouse, 400 So. Phillips Avenue  
Sioux Falls, South Dakota  
U.S.A.

■ Phone: 605-330-4505


■ Web:

■ Category: Court Judges

\*Author of original report:

Biased Judges Protecting Their Own

**Lawrence "Larry" Piersol, Chief United States District Judge Complaint of Judicial Misconduct ;  
- Lawrence Piersol gross impropriety, election 2004 Sioux Falls South Dakota**



These four “*cover letters*” exist in the very same “Court Record” to which this EIGHTH CIRCUIT refers, but with which Piersol’s fraudulent “case dismissals” conspicuously OMITTS and ignores. This Piersol did while also “*dismissing*” as “*moot*” the inclusive even more relevant EVIDENCE – which was embedded by Beneficiary into the other “Motions” filings – which were incorporated in writing by reference in the ORIGINAL COMPLAINT(s) of EACH of the two cases. <sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> For the “*first case*”, see Doc. 1 pages #259-252, ¶¶ 449(a – being 19 pp); 449(b – being 38pp + added EXHIBITS #1-5); 449 (c – being 12 pages + added EXHIBITS #1-3 as also described more fully on pp. 40-41 of “*Beneficiary/Relator’s*” 44-page “EMERGENCY MOTION TO EXPEDITE and MOTION FOR IMMEDIATE TEMPORARY DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF” submitted to the USDCEDM on 1/5/21 with reference to the following (below this paragraph) as “EXHIBITS A, B. and C”. Note that the referenced “*Emergency Motion to Expedite...*” that was assigned to CO-TRUSTEE “*judicial usurper*” Victoria Roberts at the USDC for the EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN has been posted at the following ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD link: [http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/3cEXH-3\\_010521\\_Mot4TempDECLINJRelief.pdf](http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/3cEXH-3_010521_Mot4TempDECLINJRelief.pdf)

EXHIBIT A: “DECLARATION of David Schied (dated 10/15/20) Invoking the ‘Common Law’ Jurisdiction and/or the ‘Federal’ Jurisdiction in Halting Eviction via QUO WARRANTO, Notice of ‘INTENT TO LIEN’, Claims of DISABILITY’ and ‘MEDICAL FRAILITY’, and ‘To Prevent Further Spread of COVID-19’” (40 pages); [http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/101120\\_SchiedDeclarationUnderMoratorium-SIGNED.pdf](http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/101120_SchiedDeclarationUnderMoratorium-SIGNED.pdf)

EXHIBIT B: “AMICUS IN TREATISE: Interpreting the Unconstitutional History of Federal and National Governance of the Patriotic ‘People’ and Other ‘Free Persons’ Inhabiting the United States” (313 pages); See how to download this copyrighted and “*encrypted*” document at the following link: [http://www.ricobusters.com/?page\\_id=527](http://www.ricobusters.com/?page_id=527)



Thus, Piersol's "*gross omissions*" of these very relevant documents with FACTS "*incorporated*" by Beneficiary into the ORIGINAL COMPLAINT, constitute the "*constructive*" basis – with "*obstruction of justice*" as the underlying reason – for Piersol refusing to consider and/or to address all of those very relevant FACTS, as delivered in verifiable STATEMENTS with hordes of accompanying – even undeniably embedded – EVIDENCE.

Piersol not only engaged in such "*gross omissions*" throughout his FRAUDULENT "*Judgment(s)*" in dismissal of Beneficiary's entire TWO cases, he also issued fraudulent citations, portraying exact quotes of Beneficiary in different words so as to MISLEAD THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT judges on their "*de novo*" review of what this "*judge*" wishes to minimize in significance for these "*higher court*" judges.

For example, "*Fraudster*" Lawrence Piersol cited the following on the bottom of page 12 of his FRAUDULENT "MEMORANDUM AND OPINION":

*"Plaintiff has set forth a frivolous and malicious conspiracy theory that judges in the Eastern District of Michigan have engaged in judicial misconduct about which he has complained numerous times, and about which he has "70 boxes of information."*

---

**EXHIBIT C:** "MEMORANDUM OF RIGHTS OF (WE), 'THE PEOPLE'" (183 pages) as also referenced earlier in Footnote #11.

[http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/MemorandumofPeoplesRights\\_KhalilCase.pdf](http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/MemorandumofPeoplesRights_KhalilCase.pdf)

reason alone, his claim is dismissed. In addition, however, Plaintiff has set forth a frivolous and malicious conspiracy theory that judges in the Eastern District of Michigan have engaged in judicial misconduct about which he has complained numerous times, and about which he has “70 boxes of information.” (Doc. 1, ¶ 240). He accuses those judges of operating a “protectionist racket of insurrectionism and domestic terrorism,” (id.), and further accuses them of

I used the word “EVIDENCE”

As the above screen shot of Piersol’s document shows, while Piersol correctly references Beneficiary’s filing IN QUOTES as pertaining to “*paragraph 240*”, the screen shot (shown below) of Beneficiary’s paragraph 240 (as cited on his pages 169-170) is significantly different, and much more impactful in preemptively countering Beneficiary/Relator’s anticipation that judicial usurpers like Piersol will continue resort to such tactics of “*FRAUD UPON THE COURT*”. What Beneficiary had actually written in his “*Brief*” (¶240) was “70 boxes of HARD EVIDENCE”, not “information” as cited fraudulently by Piersol.

240. As BENEFICIARY David Schied has referenced, there ate over seventy (70) boxes of hard EVIDENCE against both STATE and UNITED STATES “judicial usurpers” that have – in so many differing and “colorable” ways similar to the recent tortuous affirmative acts of self-appointed now “senior judge” Victoria Roberts, CO-TRUSTEE named herein as well as her cohorts in crime at the USDC-EDM of Denise Page Hood, Avern Cohn, Stephen Murphy, Terrence Berg, and numerous other alleged “judicial usurpers” of the “federal” ARTICLE III “COURTS OF RECORD”. BENEFICIARY has the RECORDS of an exhaustive list of such

“judges” who are operating in the EDM and in the SIXTH CIRCUIT – against whom he has many times over filed “judicial misconduct” complaints that have gone ignored by the existing status quo of a “protectionist racket” of insurrectionism and domestic terrorism being allowed to operate in that section of the CO-TRUSTEES “UNITED STATES” jurisdiction. These are cases whereby “The Accused” have issued subjective and discretionary “summary judgment(s)” against BENEFICIARY in a plethora of “backward-looking-access-to-court” cases that are tantamount to “abuse of process” amounting to “credibility determinations” on FACTUAL issues that were never litigated or allowed before a Petit Jury or Grand Jury, and/or for which there was never a genuine dispute.



In this instant U-HAUL case, Piersol's Seditious and Treason "*as a matter of record*" were not as overt and obvious; but instead, more subtle. **For just one of as many examples as there are "Counts"** – both fraudulently addressed by Piersol and "*affirmatively*" omitted of a proper address by Piersol, both "under color of law" – has already been presented earlier herein (i.e., see again p.21 herein) with reference to Piersol stating that – in spite of the countermanding EVIDENCE written right into the TABLE OF CONTENTS of Beneficiary's "*ORIGINAL COMPLAINT*" that Beneficiary somehow "*d[id] not allege any facts against... DOES #1-20*". **That was a blatant LIE!** ... as a matter of the "*official RECORD*".

At the very least, Piersol's "*dismissals*" of all CLAIMS once again barred Beneficiary's "*access to the court*" by way of preventing necessary "Discovery" for flushing out these FACTS in the face of the named CO-TRUSTEES, who were also barred from "*answering*" to these claims by an obvious civil (42 U.S.C. §1983) and criminal "*conspiracy to deprive of rights under color of law*" (18 U.S.C. §§241-242) committed between Lange, Piersol and Thelen, at minimum.

Let it be known by this EIGHTH CIRCUIT "*COURT OF APPEALS*" – in case the EIGHTH CIRCUIT "*tribunal*" assigned to the "*first case*" is "set up" with different judges than the *tribunal* assigned to the "*second case*" – that **the following graphic citations are from that "*first case*" submission of CLAIM and APPEAL:**


Let it be known by this EIGHTH CIRCUIT "COURT OF APPEALS" that as a former public schoolteacher who is STILL credentialed to teach in any school district of the STATE OF MICHIGAN (License #PF0000000802089; Expiration 06/30/2022), even Beneficiary/Relator has subscribed to the standard government OATH to "support the Constitution of the USA" and to "faithfully discharge the duties of the office [of educator]".

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
State Board of Education Department of Education  
**PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION CERTIFICATE RENEWAL**


awarded to  
**DAVID SCHIED**

In accordance with the provisions of Act 287 of the Public Acts of 1994, the holder of this certificate is authorized to teach in any Michigan school all subjects and grades indicated.

Secondary  
COGNITIVE IMPAIRMENT (S) K-12  
EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY (NP) 5-12  
EMOTIONAL IMPAIRMENT (SE) K-12  
LEARNING DISABILITIES (S) K-12  
PHYSICAL or OTHER HEALTH IMPAIRMENT (SO) K-12



Issue Date: 06/06/2017  
Expiration Date: 06/09/2022  
License Number: PF0000000802089

  
Brian J. Whiston  
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Certification requirements are subject to change. The certificate holder is responsible for being knowledgeable about current and revised regulations. It is the responsibility of the certificate holder to maintain a valid appropriate certification by meeting the requirements for certificate renewal as prescribed by statute and/or the State Board of Education.

**MICHIGAN PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR'S CODE OF ETHICS**

The following ethical standards address the professional educator's commitment to the student and the profession:

- |                                     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Service toward common good -</b> | The professional educator's primary goal is to support the growth and development of all learners for the purpose of creating and sustaining an informed citizenry in a democratic society.                                                                      |
| <b>Mutual respect -</b>             | Professional educators respect the inherent dignity and worth of each individual.                                                                                                                                                                                |
| <b>Equity -</b>                     | Professional educators advocate the practice of equity. The professional educator advocates for equal access to educational opportunities for each individual.                                                                                                   |
| <b>Diversity -</b>                  | Professional educators promote cross-cultural awareness by honoring and valuing individual differences and supporting the strengths of all individuals to ensure that instruction reflects the realities and diversity of the world.                             |
| <b>Truth and honesty -</b>          | Professional educators uphold personal and professional integrity and behave in a trustworthy manner. They adhere to acceptable social practices, current state law, state and national student assessment guidelines, and exercise sound professional judgment. |


**ADVISORY TO EDUCATOR**

In accordance with Public Act 96 of the Public Acts of 1995, it is a criminal misdemeanor to : use a suspended, surrendered, revoked, nullified, fraudulently obtained, altered or forged educator certificate, or a certificate of another person.



TO BE EMPLOYED AS AN EDUCATOR IN MICHIGAN THE EDUCATOR OATH MUST BE SIGNED, NOTARIZED, AND SUBMITTED TO YOUR EMPLOYER. THIS IS AN OFFICIAL CERTIFICATE ONCE SIGNED AND NOTARIZED.

**EDUCATOR OATH - STATE OF MICHIGAN**

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support the Constitution of the United States of America and the Constitution of the State of Michigan, and that I will faithfully discharge the duties of the office of educator according to the best of my ability.


  
Educator Signature

This certificate was subscribed and sworn to before me, along with picture identification, on 6/6/2017

  
Notary Print Name  
  
Notary Signature

Commission Expires: 8/29/2021

**SARAH BJORNHOLM**  
NOTARY PUBLIC - MICHIGAN  
WAYNE COUNTY  
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES 08/29/2021  
ACTING IN OAKLAND COUNTY

  
Notary Seal

EMPLOYERS MUST VERIFY EDUCATOR CERTIFICATIONS AT: <https://mdoe.state.mi.us/MOECSPublicCredentialSearch.aspx>  
For information on the renewal or advancement requirements of this educator certificate please go to [www.michigan.gov/teachercert](http://www.michigan.gov/teachercert)

Having subscribed to such an Oath, as a schoolteacher Beneficiary/Relator was trained to be a part of a national group expected to hold oneself and other “peer professionals” to high standards of government performance. The same can only be more expected of STATE and UNITED STATES judges.

Yet, in spite of Beneficiary/Relator submitting incalculable numbers of documents into the “Court Record” proving his own compliance with such standards of Oath and Performance of DUTIES as a schoolteacher and as a government FUNCTIONARY – proving also the “sedition”, the “insurrection”, and the “treason” of numerous STATE and UNITED STATES as “CO-TRUSTEES” functioning as “judges” who are NOT living “honorably” to either Oaths (even if they have subscribed to them) <sup>24</sup> or Duties – and Piersol and

---

<sup>24</sup> See “Exhibit R” – as a cover letter to former MICHIGAN ATTORNEY GENERAL Bill Schuette, which is accompanied by “Affidavit in Petition and Notice” signed by eight (8) concerned citizens in complaint about (in office as “chief judge” at the time) Virgil Smith being a usurper of the judicial bench of the WAYNE COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT in the CITY OF DETROIT of the EDM.

This single “AFFIDAVIT” is marked within “EXHIBIT #105” that had accompanied many more listed documents of EVIDENCE that were submitted to the SIXTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS in 2015 to challenge certain “*decisions*” being made by the “*federal magistrate*” (Hluchaniuk) and “*judge*” (Cohn) who were “*striking*” documents and “*dismissing*” the case brought against another “*judicial usurper*” – Karen Khalil – whose acts “*shocked the conscience*” of onlookers and witnesses when ordering the “*kidnapping*” and “*false imprisonment*” of one sitting quietly in the public gallery of the People’s courtroom as “*court-watcher*” (a.k.a. court “*observer*”) in June 2012. Thus, Beneficiary/Relator was then in 2015 acting in the capacity of a “*Private Attorney*



General” on behalf of himself and others “*similarly situated*” in filing a “QUO WARRANTO” complaint in the Sixth Circuit.

That case was a matter in which the CLAIM against the “*domestic terrorism*” insurance policy and “*risk management*” policy of the two “*co-defendants*” of the CHARTER COUNTY OF WAYNE and the CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF REDFORD were valued at more than \$100 BILLION, with the UNITED STATES guaranteeing up to eighty percent (80%) on AIG’s “*errors and omissions*” insurance “*rider*”. When that case – which was simultaneously filed in Beneficiary/Relator’s own ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD – was “*summarily dismissed*” just like this instant one (by Piersol) without address of the overwhelming EVIDENCE, Beneficiary/Relator formalized his disagreement in the form of a COMMON LAW “Writ of Coram Nobis”; and thereafter claimed TREBLE DAMAGES against the UNITED STATES in the amount of \$300 BILLION. [http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/021321\\_WritofErrorandCorbumNobis-1.pdf](http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/021321_WritofErrorandCorbumNobis-1.pdf)

This numbered “EXHIBIT #105” contained its own complete set of lettered “*exhibits*”, with “EXHIBIT R” (i.e., see pp. 109-116) therein being a cover letter to the MICHIGAN AG Schuette (dated 8/21/12) accompanied by a five (5) page AFFIDAVIT signed by eight (8) “*concerned citizens of Wayne County*” – submitted along with “*certifying EVIDENCE*” from the MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF STATE’S OFFICE OF THE GREAT SEAL showing that WC Circuit Court “*chief judge*” had “*no Oath of Office on record*” between 2005-2012 as he otherwise sat USURPING that “*judicial*” office.

This 144-page “EXHIBIT #105”, which holds EVIDENCE that it was also submitted in a separate STATE case to the ultra-corrupt “MICHIGAN COURT OF APPEALS” has been posted publicly on the Internet for the past five (5) full years at:

[https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/010816\\_QuoWarranto\\_6thCircuitJudges/Exhibits/Ex\\_105\\_TwoMotforVacateSetAside%26Order4GJInvestigation.pdf](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/010816_QuoWarranto_6thCircuitJudges/Exhibits/Ex_105_TwoMotforVacateSetAside%26Order4GJInvestigation.pdf)

This “QUO WARRANTO” document has been posted publicly for well over for over five (5) full years without further challenge, as still available today at:

[https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/010816\\_QuoWarranto\\_6thCircuitJudges/FinalDocs/010816\\_QuoWarrantoon6thCirJudges ALL](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/010816_QuoWarranto_6thCircuitJudges/FinalDocs/010816_QuoWarrantoon6thCirJudges_ALL)  
and also at:

[http://constitutionalgov.us/SupremeCourtOfLaw/Cases/SchiedVsRoberts/PrimaryEvidenceDocuments/010816\\_QuoWarrantoon6thCirJudges ALL](http://constitutionalgov.us/SupremeCourtOfLaw/Cases/SchiedVsRoberts/PrimaryEvidenceDocuments/010816_QuoWarrantoon6thCirJudges_ALL)

**Lange have both acted in “bad behavior” to also “affirmatively” ignore and dismiss these documents of FACTS.**

The above sets of verifiable FACTS referenced by Beneficiary/Relator on his “original” filings – to include reference to the previous documents filed also in the “EDM” case that was fraudulently thrown out by CO-TRUSTEES “senior judge” and STATE BAR OF MICHIGAN crime syndicate member, Victoria Roberts, and subsequently gross negligently OMITTED of having any address by the “WDSD” and Lawrence Piersol – can also be found in this instant ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD as recently posted at: [http://www.ricobusters.com/?page\\_id=511](http://www.ricobusters.com/?page_id=511)

---


Importantly, the SIXTH CIRCUIT “judges” answered this “Quo Warranto” COMPLAINT and EVIDENCE with silence – affirmatively in TACIT AGREEMENT – creating an additional (“secondary”) layer of “RICO” coverup of these “predicate” level crimes of their “peer group” of other STATE and UNITED STATES “judges” (as all “CO-TRUSTEE” members of the STATE BAR OF MICHIGAN) disregarding the FACT that the Affidavit cited numerous Michigan laws mandating the DUTY of the Michigan attorney general to file his own “QUO WARRANTO” complaint in the Michigan Court of Appeals against anyone described as Smith who clearly is in violation of “MCL 168.422 (“the office of circuit judge shall become vacant upon happening of...his neglect or refusal to take and subscribe to the constitutional oath of office...”))

The set of “EXHIBITS” for an “En Banc” review of the matter – also affirmatively ignored by the SIXTH CIRCUIT – have been posted this past five (5) years at the following public link:

[https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEdM/111416\\_Orderto6thCircuit4EnBancReviewofQuoWarranto/EXHIBITS/](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEdM/111416_Orderto6thCircuit4EnBancReviewofQuoWarranto/EXHIBITS/)

## TIMELINESS OF THIS APPEAL

In the “*first case*”, subsequent to the “*Clerk of the Court*” committing a preliminary level of fraudulence on the “*Docketing Items*” recorded by an arbitrary and capricious “*timeline*” prior to Beneficiary filing his “*Brief on CLAIM and APPEAL*”, the two “*judges*” – **Lange and Piersol** – added their own level of fraudulence. As an extra layer of grossly negligent “*whitewash*” over Beneficiary’s honest and respectable lawsuit against the “UNITED STATES, et al”. Piersol’s part in that fraudulence included signing a “*judgment*” that relabeled the entire “*first case*”, turning it into his own dishonest “sham” case of “David Schied vs. DEPOSITORS INSURANCE COMPANY, et al” instead.





In this “second [inextricably intertwined] case”, Piersol’s fraudulence was submitted just three business days later on 8/2/21.

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                             |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, INC., DOES #1-20,<br><br>Defendants.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                             |
| For the reasons contained in the Order Granting Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Proceed In Forma Pauperis and Screening Order for Dismissal, it is<br><br>ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Plaintiff’s Complaint, Doc. 1, is frivolous and dismissed without prejudice.<br><br>DATED August <u>2<sup>nd</sup></u> , 2021. |                                                                                                                                                             |
| ATTEST:<br>MATTHEW W. THELEN, CLERK<br>                                                                                                                                                                                                   | BY THE COURT:<br><br>Lawrence L. Piersol<br>United States District Judge |

Subsequently, on 8/8/21, Beneficiary/Relator “*filed*” his three-pronged response to these Seditious and Treasonous acts, which was captioned as:

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                               |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, INC., DOES 1-20<br>“CO-TRUSTEES”                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | JUDGE <u>Lawrence Piersol</u> |
| <p>1) <u>“COMMON LAW ‘WRIT OF ERROR CORAM NOBIS’ IN OPPOSITION TO PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE OF ‘CRIMINAL FRAUD AND CONSPIRACY TO DEPRIVE OF RIGHTS’ INVOLVING ‘JUDICIAL USURPERS’ AND ‘CLERKS OF THE COURTS’ AS ‘AGENTS’ OF THE NAMED ‘CO-TRUSTEES’ OF THE CASE CAPTIONED ABOVE”;</u></p> <p>2) <u>“FINDING OF CONTEMPT” AND “CERTIFICATION OF FAULT/DEFAULT WITH ‘DEFAULT JUDGMENT’ AND COMMON LAW ‘LEDGER OF [TREBLE] DAMAGES”;</u></p> <p>3) <u>“NOTICE OF ‘CLAIM OF APPEAL’ FOR THE REASONS CITED ABOVE AND BASED UPON ‘OVERRIDING AND PALPABLE ERRORS’ AND GROSS OMISSIONS OF FACTS; AND INTENTIONAL [TORTUOUS] VIOLATIONS OF THE ‘RULES ENABLING ACT’”</u></p> |                               |



Two weeks later, the EIGHTH CIRCUIT “*Clerk*” Michael Gans asserted on 8/23/21 that the COA had the **purported** “*docket entries*”; along with the following “*statement*” written in meaningful CONFLICT with the actual FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURES:

*“The case has been referred to the court for initial review and no briefing schedule has been set. You do not need to file any additional documents or pleadings at this time. We will advise you of any action taken in this case.”*

The above “*message*” sent by Clerk Gans to dissuade Beneficiary from filing an “APPEAL BRIEF” or anything else is a stark deviation from **FRAP 28.1(f)(1)** which otherwise states –

*“Time to Serve and File a Brief: the appellant’s principal brief, within 40 days after the record is filed;*”

Therefore, this instant filing of “BRIEF” ON “CLAIM” AND “APPEAL” is timely filed.

### **STATEMENT OF THE FACTS RELEVANT TO THE ISSUES PRESENTED HEREIN FOR REVIEW**

Beneficiary/Relator incorporates all listed FACTS – to include all STATEMENTS made thus far in the RECORD of BOTH the “first case” (*Schied v. USA, et al*”) and the “second case” (“*Schied v. U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, et al*”) – whether determined as “*dismissed*”, “*stricken*”, “*sealed*”, or rendered “*moot*” by the criminals referenced herein as “*judge*” Piersol and “*clerk*” Thelen – as submitted

in Common Law to the ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD by Beneficiary David Schied.

In particular, Beneficiary incorporates listed FACTS – to include all STATEMENTS and ARGUMENTS made thus far in the Record – of the documents “*filed*” – as well as all those referenced by those filings – but never fully acknowledged by the USDC “*clerk*” as shown below:

- 1) “COMMON LAW ‘WRIT OF ERROR CORAM NOBIS’ IN OPPOSITION TO PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE OF ‘CRIMINAL FRAUD AND CONSPIRACY TO DEPRIVE OF RIGHTS’ INVOLVING ‘JUDICIAL USURPERS’ AND ‘CLERKS OF THE COURTS’ AS ‘AGENTS’ OF THE NAMED ‘CO-TRUSTEES’ OF THE CASE CAPTIONED ABOVE”;
- 2) “FINDING OF CONTEMPT” AND “CERTIFICATION OF FAULT/DEFAULT WITH ‘DEFAULT JUDGMENT’ AND COMMON LAW ‘LEDGER OF [TREBLE] DAMAGES”;
- 3) “NOTICE OF ‘CLAIM OF APPEAL’ FOR THE REASONS CITED ABOVE AND BASED UPON ‘OVERRIDING AND PALPABLE ERRORS’ AND GROSS OMISSIONS OF FACTS; AND INTENTIONAL [TORTUOUS] VIOLATIONS OF THE ‘RULES ENABLING ACT’”

These instant “*DEFAULT*”, “*COMMON LAW WRIT*”, and “*NOTICE OF CLAIM(S)*” actions come in opposition to the dated and signed (and undated and unsigned) actions deliberately taken by the actors and jesters who have long been collectively operating a “*CONTINUING FINANCIAL CRIMES ENTERPRISE*” as the so-called “*UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT*”; one usurping the Federal jurisdiction of the “EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, SOUTHERN DIVISION” (hereafter “USDCEDM”) in the CITY OF DETROIT, and in the CHARTER COUNTY OF WAYNE, and the other usurping the Federal jurisdiction of the “DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA, WESTERN DIVISION” (hereafter “USDCSDWD”) in CITY RAPID CITY (and/or SIOUX FALLS) of the STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA.

**Because the lower court Clerk has NOT provided Beneficiary with any date-stamped confirmation of certain documents “*filed*” in BOTH cases (by USPS mailing to the USDCSDWD) by Beneficiary since the “original” filings of**

**both cases** – to include the above listed “*Writ of Coram Nobis...Finding of Contempt ... Fault/ Default...Default Judgment...Ledger of Damages*” (in both cases, one on 8/6/21 and the other on 8/8/21) as well as Beneficiary/Relator’s “**OBJECTION TO SEALING OF CASE and MOTION TO SHOW CAUSE**” dated and “*filed*” on 6/4/21, all supported by accompanying “**PROOF OF SERVICE**” filings (as shown below and on the next page) – **and because the USDC “clerk” has also NOT provided Beneficiary with any REQUESTED copy of the updated DOCKET SHEET for that “first case” lower court record** verifying that the above “*filings*” have actually been entered into the SEALED lower court record and actually transferred to the EIGHTH CIRCUIT as provided in written assurance – **Beneficiary incorporates herein the entirety of his own public, COMMON LAW “ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD” belonging to We, The People, which acknowledges and contains the receipt by the USDCSDWD of these documents as they were “officially” filed, leaving no room for any doubt.** This includes all documents listed and all links to pages with referenced resources and documents that were otherwise DENIED DISCOVERY in this case by the criminal usurper of judicial office, Lawrence Piersol, located at:

**[http://www.ricobusters.com/?page\\_id=342](http://www.ricobusters.com/?page_id=342)** (for the “*first case*”) and at:

**[http://www.ricobusters.com/?page\\_id=345](http://www.ricobusters.com/?page_id=345)** (for the “*second case*”).

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA,  
WESTERN DIVISION

David Schied, one of the *Sovereign People*;  
Recognized by the U.S. CONSTITUTION  
"BENEFICIARY" / RELATOR

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al  
"CO-TRUSTEES"

Civ. No. 21-5030

JUDGE Lawrence Piersol

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

This is to certify that today, 8/6/21, BENEFICIARY/RELATOR David Schied, having established his ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD by serving the DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA – placed into the U.S. ("Priority") MAIL – the signed "ORIGINALS" of the following documents for purposes of receiving time/date stamped copies back from the Court as assured would occur by the Clerk of the Court during a phone conversation dated Monday, 4/19/21:

- 1) BENEFICIARY's / RELATOR's "COMMON LAW 'WRIT OF ERROR CORAM NOBIS' IN OPPOSITION TO PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE OF 'CRIMINAL FRAUD AND CONSPIRACY TO DEPRIVE OF RIGHTS' INVOLVING 'JUDICIAL USURPERS' AND 'CLERKS OF THE COURTS' AS 'AGENTS' OF THE NAMED 'CO-TRUSTEES' OF THE CASE CAPTIONED ABOVE"; (19 pages) and
- 2) "FINDING OF CONTEMPT" AND "CERTIFICATION OF FAULT/DEFAULT WITH 'DEFAULT JUDGMENT' AND COMMON LAW 'LEDGER OF [TREBLE] DAMAGES"; (included in the 19 pages)
- 3) "NOTICE OF 'CLAIM OF APPEAL' FOR THE REASONS CITED ABOVE AND BASED UPON 'OVERRIDING AND PALPABLE ERRORS' AND GROSS OMISSIONS OF FACTS; AND INTENTIONAL [TORTUOUS] VIOLATIONS OF THE 'RULES ENABLING ACT'; (included in the 19 pages)
- 4) This instant PROOF OF SERVICE (1 page)

Truthfully submitted,

/s/ David Schied

Date: 8/6/21

DISABLED / BENEFICIARY  
David Schied - RELATOR  
P.O. Box 321  
SPEARFISH, S. DAKOTA 57783  
605-580-5121 (all calls recorded)

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA,  
WESTERN DIVISION

**David Schied, one of the *Sovereign* People;**  
**Recognized by the U.S. CONSTITUTION**  
**"BENEFICIARY" / RELATOR**  
v.  
**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al**  
**"CO-TRUSTEES"**

Civ. No. 21-5030

JUDGE Lawrence Piersol

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

This is to certify that today, 6/4/21, BENEFICIARY David Schied, having established his ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD by serving the DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA – placed into the U.S. ("Priority") MAIL – the "*ORIGINALS*" of the following documents for purposes of receiving time/date stamped copies back from the Court as assured would occur by the Clerk of the Court during a phone conversation dated Monday, 4/19/21:

- 1) BENEFICIARY's / RELATOR's OBJECTION TO SEALING OF CASE. (20 pages not including Cover Page and Table of Contents)
- 2) BENEFICIARY's / RELATOR's MOTION TO SHOW CAUSE; (filed concurrent in the above)
- 3) BENEFICIARY's / RELATOR's DEMAND (OR ORDER) FOR FEDERAL SPECIAL GRAND JURY INVESTIGATION (filed concurrent in the above)
- 4) BENEFICIARY / RELATOR David Schied's STATEMENT OF TRUTH (included as the final page of the above)
- 5) This instant PROOF OF SERVICE (1 pages)

Truthfully submitted,

/s/ David Schied

Date: 6/4/21

DISABLED / BENEFICIARY  
David Schied - RELATOR  
P.O. Box 321  
SPEARFISH, S. DAKOTA 57783  
605-580-5121 (all calls recorded)



David Schied – BENEFICIARY / RELATOR  
P.O. Box 321  
Spearfish, South Dakota  
(all calls recorded)  
605-580-5121

8/8/2021

Attn: Clerk of the Court – Matthew Thelen  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA  
400 S. Phillips Ave.  
Sioux Falls, SD 57104  
[Matt.Thelen@sdd.uscourts.gov](mailto:Matt.Thelen@sdd.uscourts.gov)

**RE: NOTICE OF "CLAIM OF APPEAL" on Schied v. U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL case**

Clerk of the Court Matthew Thelen:

Please file the following list of documents to the above referenced case as copied below from the accompanying "PROOF OF SERVICE" also dated today.

- 1) BENEFICIARY's / RELATOR's "COMMON LAW 'WRIT OF ERROR CORAM NOBIS' IN OPPOSITION TO PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE OF 'CRIMINAL FRAUD AND CONSPIRACY TO DEPRIVE OF RIGHTS' INVOLVING 'JUDICIAL USURPERS' AND 'CLERKS OF THE COURTS' AS 'AGENTS' OF THE NAMED 'CO-TRUSTEES' OF THE CASE CAPTIONED ABOVE"; (21 pages) and
- 2) "FINDING OF CONTEMPT" AND "CERTIFICATION OF FAULT/DEFAULT WITH 'DEFAULT JUDGMENT' AND COMMON LAW 'LEDGER OF [TREBLE] DAMAGES"; (included in the 21 pages)
- 3) "'NOTICE OF 'CLAIM OF APPEAL' FOR THE REASONS CITED ABOVE AND BASED UPON 'OVERRIDING AND PALPABLE ERRORS' AND GROSS OMISSIONS OF FACTS; AND INTENTIONAL [TORTUOUS] VIOLATIONS OF THE 'RULES ENABLING ACT'"; (included in the 21 pages)
- 4) This instant PROOF OF SERVICE (1 page)

Additionally, Please send me date-stamped proof of your filing of these pages along with an updated DOCKET SHEET for the entire case.

Respectively,

/s/ David Schied  
BENEFICIARY / RELATOR to the Sovereign People

This COMMON LAW ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD for the “*first case*” includes all items and activities of the EIGHTH CIRCUIT occurring subsequent to the criminal activity at the lower “USDCSDWD” as shown, with relevant links to other documents, at: [http://www.ricobusters.com/?page\\_id=531](http://www.ricobusters.com/?page_id=531)

This same RECORD includes all items of most relevant reference – as was included in the lower court filings but covered up by the “*dismissing*” and declaring as “*moot*” the entirety of the lower USDC court(s) records by **Victoria Roberts** in the USDCEDM and of **Lawrence Piersol** in the USDCSDWD – located at: [http://www.ricobusters.com/?page\\_id=511](http://www.ricobusters.com/?page_id=511)

All items and activities of the EIGHTH CIRCUIT pertaining to this instant “*second case*” and occurring subsequent to the criminal activity at the lower “USDCSDWD” as shown, with relevant links to other documents is located at: [http://www.ricobusters.com/?page\\_id=536](http://www.ricobusters.com/?page_id=536)

It is a FACT that Piersol’s FRAUDULENT “Judgment(s)” (against both cases) as well as his “Memorandum / Opinion / Order of Dismissal” (of the “*first case*”) claiming “No Facts upon which relief [will] be granted”, and his “Screening Order for Dismissal” (on the “*second case*”) were delivered to the public at large and to the EIGHTH CIRCUIT while *Seditiously* and *Treasonously* OMITTING proper consideration for all of the important UNREBUTTED SWORN AND NOTARIZED AFFIDAVITS included or referenced by the “*official*” Record as



matters of verifiable and irrefutable “FACTS”. This included the very important “AFFIDAVIT OF BENEFICIARY/RELATOR David Schied IN STATEMENT OF TRUTH” as shown below (on the next page) which appeared on the last page of the “*Original Complaint*” referenced by Piersol’s **fraudulent** “*official*” documents. Instead, the **only** affidavit Piersol mentioned was the one used for his granting “*forma pauperis*” status to Beneficiary, as if he was being a “*real nice guy*” rather than the **sedition and treasonous insurrectionist defrauding the American People and this EIGHTH CIRCUIT COA** while defaming the research and the reputation of Beneficiary David Schied himself.

**First**

**AFFIDAVIT OF BENEFICIARY / RELATOR David Schied**  
**in STATEMENT OF TRUTH Submitted Herein Under “Penalty of Perjury”**

**Case**

I David Schied, do hereby declare, under penalty of perjury, that the paragraphs one (1) through four-hundred-sixty (460) above herein containing statements of facts and references to evidence and laws are all honorably true, accurate, and certifiably authentic to the best of my knowledge and belief.

I am one of the Sovereign American People, who has also become a *bona fide* crime victim, a totally and permanently disabled recent quad-amputee, a grievant, a common law claimant, and an official keeper of records for at least one Article III Court of Record. I am also professing to be of sound mind; and acting in the capacity of Relator – “*ex rel*” – on behalf of others similarly situated as a Private Public Proxy and/or in such fashion as a Private Attorney General.

As a sovereign American man and constitutionally recognized “*Free Person*”, I am retaining all Rights guaranteed by the constitutions of the STATE and the UNITED under the fiduciary contracts of Public Trust documents. I hereby certify that I am additionally acting privately on my own behalf as a federally protected government whistle-blower in possession of official evidence of crimes committed by certain named and yet unnamed perpetrators as “*The Accused*”, against whom I have established sound Claims in Commerce, and whom I am now rightfully pursuing in redress while prosecuting them to the furthest extent of the Law.

Truthfully submitted,

/s/ David Schied

Date: 4/20/21

261

DISABLED / BENEFICIARY  
David Schied - RELATOR  
P.O. Box 321  
SPEARFISH, S. DAKOTA  
57783  
605-580-5121

**Second**

**SWORN AFFIDAVIT OF TRUTH**

**Case**

I, David Schied, herein and hereby declare and solemnly swear – under penalty of “*perjury*” as defined by indictment of Grand Jury and adjudicated by a sovereign Jury Trial by my peers – that the foregoing is the accurate and complete truth, to the best of my information and belief, so help me God.

/s/ David Schied, “*Beneficiary*”

(authorized “*legal signature*” by “*reasonable accommodation*” to a “*quad-amputee*”)

David Schied – DISABLED / BENEFICIARY  
P.O. Box 321  
SPEARFISH, S. DAKOTA 57783  
605-580-5121 (all calls recorded)

Piersol acted with malfeasance when ignoring 4 CFR § 22.6, which addresses how judges and others in positions of DELEGATED “*government authority*” should handle “*Motions, Briefs, and Other Statements* [Rule 6]” **with accountability** to include “(c) **Declarations, affidavits, or other statements**” and when delivering “(d) **Motions for Summary Judgment**”. In this case there was never such a “*motion*” but Piersol delivered a “*Summary Judgment*” anyway on his own, *sua sponte* (Latin meaning “*voluntarily*”).

**(c) Declarations, affidavits, or other statements.** Any declaration, affidavit, or other statement that is submitted to explain the record must, to the maximum extent possible, include citations to the record in support of the statement, argument, or analysis made. Citations to the record must be specific (*i.e.*, to Bates number or similar designation). Declarations, affidavits, or other statements containing inadequate citations may be returned to the party with an order that the party resubmit the statement with appropriate revisions.

**(d) Motions for summary judgment -**

**(1) Generally.** Motions for summary judgment or partial summary judgment shall be filed only when a party believes, based on uncontested material facts, that it is entitled to relief, in whole or in part, as a matter of law. Such motions shall be filed as soon as practicable to allow the Board to rule on the motion in advance of a scheduled hearing. In considering a motion, or partial motion, for summary judgment, the Board will consider the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, admissions of record, and affidavits provided, and will grant such motion if there is no genuine issue of material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. In deciding motions for summary judgment, the Board will look to Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for guidance.

Essentially, Piersol has turned the “*spirit*” – as well as the “*letter*” – of the law on its head; ignoring the uncontested “*material facts*” presented by Beneficiary David Schied and voluntarily acting as if it was the UNITED STATES that had been the one to submit a “*motion*” with uncontested facts and requested relief.

Thus, it is a FACT that on page 251-252 of his “ORIGINAL COMPLAINT” (in his “*first case*”), Beneficiary had also incorporated by reference into his “*pleadings*” his “AFFIDAVIT OF TRUTH OF David Schied” as shown below. <sup>28</sup>

449. Moreover, given that certain other “Motions” to this instant case and court are being filed simultaneously and in accompaniment with this instant “ORIGINAL COMPLAINT” as presented in his PROOF OF SERVICE to this instant ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD offering specific background FACTS and furthering EVIDENCE substantiating the many CLAIMS against the CO-TRUSTEES, BENEFICIARY incorporates by reference the paragraphs from the following sets of documents as if reiterated herein verbatim:

• • •

- 3) “AFFIDAVIT OF TRUTH of David Schied” – This Affidavit, sworn recently before a STATE notary in Michigan on 2/19/21, attests to the authenticity and truthfulness of the documents listed above, as well as other documents. It explains, in part, how – as a direct result of the affirmative CRIMINAL acts of the CO-TRUSTEES acting tortuously in both their private and public capacities, CO-TRUSTEES discriminated against, retaliated against, and caused great personal “*life-threatening*” injury against BENEFICIARY by having forcibly threatened him to the point of then causing him to

251

be EVICTED from his home, without ADA “*accommodations*”, without “*access*” to either STATE or UNITED STATES courts, in the dead of Winter and just after a blizzard with deep snow, during a national COVID-19 pandemic, and in criminal violation of both STATE and UNITED STATES eviction moratoriums.

---

<sup>28</sup> This 2/19/21 AFFIDAVIT is located publicly at:

<http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/AffidavitofDavidSchied021921.pdf>

**The following graphic citations are from that “first case” submission of CLAIM and APPEAL to support the remaining of this section on FACTUAL history: <sup>29</sup>**

PIERSOL “*AFFIRMATIVELY OMITTED*” ALL REFERENCED AFFIDAVITS  
WHEN DISMISSING THIS CASE AS BEING “*WITHOUT FACTS*”

By denying proper “*due process*” of “**DISCOVERY**”, Piersol denied Beneficiary/Relator “*access*” to the USDC by refusing to accept as FACT that Beneficiary/Relator had actually complied with court rules when constructing “*concise*” statements of the allegations, enough to inform “*The Accused*” of the CLAIMS to which they were to be held to answering.

In FACT, Piersol instead answered these allegations himself *summarily* with nothing but “*threadbare conclusions*” – for and on behalf of “*The Accused*” – while at the same time intentionally misleading those reading and depending upon the integrity of his actions (and FRAUDULENT “*judgment*”) into believing that it was Beneficiary/Relator who wrote with unsupported conclusions and “*threadbare*” allegations. This is antithetical to both the *spirit* and the *letter* of the laws governing Constitutionally guarantees of protected DUE PROCESS.

FRCP Rule 56(c)(4) and 56(d),(e), and (f) altogether address the value of Affidavits in establishing matters of **uncontested** STATEMENTS OF FACTS sufficient for any *legitimate “judge”* to justify a party’s legal *standing* as valid, enough to issue “*Summary Judgment*” in favor of a “*nonmovant*” **if unrebutted**. In this case, Beneficiary/Relator was the “*nonmovant*” until declaring his own “*CERTIFICATION OF FAULT/DEFAULT*” and “*DEFAULT JUDGMENT*” against the UNITED STATES based upon the fraudulent acts of both Thelen and Piersol as

49

<sup>29</sup> **NOTE** that the next fourteen (14) pages reference links to the described documents. To comply with “*word count*” requirements under “*appellate rules*”, the citations are GRAPHIC REPRESENTATIONS only. The actual “*official*” document being referenced containing these links is also located at:

[http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/091021\\_Schied\\_BriefonCLAIMandAPPEAL-ALL.pdf](http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/091021_Schied_BriefonCLAIMandAPPEAL-ALL.pdf)



the agents “*representing*” the CO-TRUSTEES, as “*The Accused*”. Such certifications were also accompanied by the “[COMMON LAW] WRIT OF CORAM NOBIS...” referenced earlier as dated 8/6/21, also in CLAIM OF TREBLE DAMAGES against Piersol’s fraudulent acts.

**(4) Affidavits or Declarations.** An affidavit or declaration used to support or oppose a motion must be made on personal knowledge, set out facts that would be admissible in evidence, and show that the affiant or declarant is competent to testify on the matters stated.

**(d) WHEN FACTS ARE UNAVAILABLE TO THE NONMOVANT.** If a nonmovant shows by affidavit or declaration that, for specified reasons, it cannot present facts essential to justify its opposition, the court may:

- (1) defer considering the motion or deny it;
- (2) allow time to obtain affidavits or declarations or to take discovery; or
- (3) issue any other appropriate order.

**(e) FAILING TO PROPERLY SUPPORT OR ADDRESS A FACT.** If a party fails to properly support an assertion of fact or fails to properly address another party’s assertion of fact as required by Rule 56(c), the court may:

- (1) give an opportunity to properly support or address the fact;
- (2) consider the fact undisputed for purposes of the motion;
- (3) grant summary judgment if the motion and supporting materials — including the facts considered undisputed — show that the movant is entitled to it; or
- (4) issue any other appropriate order.

**(f) JUDGMENT INDEPENDENT OF THE MOTION.** After giving notice and a reasonable time to respond, the court may:

- (1) grant summary judgment for a nonmovant;
- (2) grant the motion on grounds not raised by a party; or

As a so-called “*senior judge*”, Piersol otherwise knows very well that **unrebutted Affidavits constitute verifiable FACTS** in the eyes of the law. Both “*case law*” (based upon statutory codes) <sup>30</sup> and COMMON LAW “*MAXIMS*” (based

---

<sup>30</sup> See **Case Law:** *White v. FCI, USA, Inc.*, 319 F. 3d 672 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003); *United Tech Corp. v. Mazer*, 556 F. 3d 1260 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2009). Also note: “*Court of Appeals may not assume the truth of allegations in a pleading which are contradicted by affidavit...the district judge has no basis for a determination of credibility.*” *Data Disc, Inc. v. Systems Tech. Assocs., Inc.* 557 F.2d 1280 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1977)

upon *Scriptural Beliefs and Customary Practices in Commerce*)<sup>27</sup> support the premise that “*Unrebutted Affidavits*” hold the highest standing next to direct testimony in establishing matters of verifiable FACTS.

Therefore, **Beneficiary/Relator incorporates herein by references all of the other AFFIDAVITS as submitted in the USDCEDM and the USDCSDWD – i.e., the two most recent “federal” cases referenced by Pierson’s fraudulent “Memorandum/Opinion/ Order” – that were included in the following numbered**

---

<sup>27</sup> See **Common Law MAXIMS**: 1) “*In Commerce, Truth is Sovereign*” (Example: John 8:32 “*And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall set you free*”); 2) “**Truth is Expressed in the Form of an Affidavit**” (Example: Lev. 19:11-13 “*Ye shall not steal, neither deal falsely, neither lie one to another. And ye shall not swear by my name falsely,...*”); 3) “**An Unrebutted Affidavit Stands as Truth in Commerce**”; 4) “**He who does not deny, admits**”; 5) “**He who does not repel a wrong when he can, occasions it**”; 6) “**He Who Leaves the Battlefield First Loses by Default**”; 7) “**He who bears the burden ought also to derive the benefit**”. (Example: Mat. 10:22 “*And ye shall be hated of all men for my name’s sake: but he that endureth to the end shall be saved.*”)

See also, the UNIVERSAL COMMERCIAL CODE, which acknowledges neither the sovereignty of the people nor the Bill of Rights. It only deals with what is on paper. U.C.C. §1-103, for example, aligns the U.C.C. with the Common Law and the Bill of Rights. It affirms that **the Code (U.C.C.) must harmonize with the Common Law**: “*The UCC relies on state common law to supplement its provisions in two important respects. The UCC does not define key terms such as ‘offer,’ ‘acceptance,’ and ‘possession, thus requiring courts to utilize state common-law definitions of these terms when applying the Code. Similarly, section 1-103 provides that state common-law rules on a wide variety of questions, including estoppel and waiver, should be used to supplement UCC provisions unless a particular UCC provision displaces the common law.*” In other words, “**...by analogizing UCC provisions to islands floating in the sea of the common law. If there is no land, the sea of the common law takes over.**” McLaughlin, Gerald T. *The Evolving Uniform Commercial Code: From Infancy to Maturity to Old Age*, 26 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 691 (1993)



paragraphs of the documents submitted along with the “Original Complaint”, that are still included in this ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD now in review by the EIGHTH CIRCUIT.

- Original Complaint - para 18, 40, 43, 46, 90, 92, 95 (footnote para 149h), 104, 446 (p.251, para 459), p.261; and Exhibit 4 - pp.43, 45, 57-58, 62, 65;
- Motion for Forma Pauperis - para 17, 23;
- Motion for Service by the US Marshal - para 4;

Had proper DUE PROCESS of “Discovery” been completed in support of the “concise” listing of “numbered statements” containing Beneficiary/Relator’s “allegations”, the following scores of other **IRREFUTABLE and UNREBUTTED Sworn and Notarized AFFIDAVITS** would have additionally become once again recognized by this ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD, as posted publicly for at least the past five (5) years:

- 1) “**SWORN FOLLOW-UP AFFIDAVIT AND CRIME REPORT OF DAVID SCHIED** In Report on 8/22/16 of Additional Crimes Committed by Magistrate Stephanie Davis, who is working as a ‘domestic terrorist’ along with other U.S. District Court Judges, Clerks and Magistrates Under Employ in the Eastern District of Michigan and in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit to Coerce the People and the Government of this District”.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>28</sup> This is the case of Schied v. Khalil, 2016 WL 4727477 (E.D. MI) referenced fraudulently by **gross omissions** by Piersol in Doc 14, pp. 13 and 25. **This document alone references the web locations of at least forty-two (42) signed and notarized un rebutted AFFIDAVITS that were DATE-STAMPED as “received” by the the USDCEDM on 8/25/16 but subsequently ignored in the same fashion as Lawrence Piersol has also done in this instant case.** NOTE: Due to past server issues at the web-hosting site, new URLs were created for the many documents of EVIDENCE that are being referenced by this and other documents. **To find the**



[https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2016\\_16thCirCOA-QuoWarranto%26EnBanc/QuoWarranto%2BEnBanc%2BUSAG-USPostalInspect/111416\\_Orderto6thCircuit4EnBancReviewofQuoWarranto/EXHIBITS/EXH\\_11\\_SwornFollowUpAffidavit%26CrimeReport42AffidavitLinks-2.pdf](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2016_16thCirCOA-QuoWarranto%26EnBanc/QuoWarranto%2BEnBanc%2BUSAG-USPostalInspect/111416_Orderto6thCircuit4EnBancReviewofQuoWarranto/EXHIBITS/EXH_11_SwornFollowUpAffidavit%26CrimeReport42AffidavitLinks-2.pdf)

- 2) “‘PAG’ [PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL] DAVID SCHIED’S STATE EX-REL & EX-PARTE ‘APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS’ IN SUPPORT OF ‘QUO WARRANTO’ FOR PROVING “JURISDICTION,” ARTICLE III ‘GOOD BEHAVIOR’ AND AUTHENTICATION OF OATHS & BONDS IN LIGHT OF PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE PROVING THAT 6TH CIRCUIT COURT JUDGES ARE FOSTERING ‘DOMESTIC TERRORISM,’ OR ALTERNATIVELY FOR THE 6TH CIRCUIT JUDGES TO COMPLY WITH THIS INSTANT ‘MANDAMUS FOR BOND AND/OR RISK MANAGEMENT INSURANCE SURRENDER, FOR VICTIMS’ RELIEF UNDER 18 U.S.C. § 3771 and 18 U.S.C. § 4; AND FOR OTHER DECLARATORY RELIEF’ BY WAY OF ‘ERRORS & OMISSIONS,’ MALFEASANCE, AND OTHER COVERAGE INFORMATION”<sup>29</sup>

[https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEdM/010816\\_QuoWarranto\\_6thCircuitJudges/FinalDocs/010815\\_AppendixofExhibits.pdf](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEdM/010816_QuoWarranto_6thCircuitJudges/FinalDocs/010815_AppendixofExhibits.pdf)

- 3) The URL containing the “EXHIBITS” referenced by the above-referenced “APPENDIX” – to include at least seventeen (17) UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVITS as matters of referenced FACTS submitted to the COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT – located at:

[https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEdM/010816\\_QuoWarranto\\_6thCircuitJudges/Exhibits/](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEdM/010816_QuoWarranto_6thCircuitJudges/Exhibits/)

location of these referenced document locations, simply replace the “*prefix*” of the referenced URL of each link beginning with

<http://cases.michigan.constitutional.gov.us/david-schied>, with the following prefix: “<https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied>”

<sup>29</sup> *Id.*

The entirety of that above-referenced COMMON LAW “*ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD*” – which includes all of the documents entered into the USDC “*record*” that were subsequently unconstitutionally “*stricken*” by the ARTICLE I “*magistrate*” named “*Michael Hluchaniuk*”, and the criminal activity occurring at the SIXTH CIRCUIT with an “*INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL*” and a subsequent “*EN BANC QUO WARRANTO*” <sup>30</sup> is all collectively posted at:

[https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/)

Other sworn and notarized AFFIDAVITS that have NEVER been rebutted though repeatedly furnished to the “*domestic terrorists*” calling themselves “*government*” in America – as also related to the “*triggering event*” that both

---

<sup>30</sup> **The full title of this document is:** “*Private Attorneys General (‘PAGs’) David Schied’s and Cornell Squires’ Common Law ‘Order for En Banc review and Answer in Report on Quo Warranto previously filed into the Sixth Circuit on 1/12/16 (as COA Docket Item #22) along with 174 ‘Itemized Exhibits’ Which contained thousands of pages of ‘Evidence of Domestic Terrorism’; yet has Altogether Remained Unanswered For One Year by the Sixth Circuit Court, by Means of Relegating Such Filing to ‘Tendered’ Status and Pending ‘Review’ by the Same ‘Clerk’ Against Whom a ‘WRIT OF ERROR’ and Accompanying ‘MANDAMUS FOR BOND SURRENDER’ (COA Dkt. #20) Had Been Issued on 12/28/15 by PAG David Schied, in a Case for Which Criminal Complaints Remain Pending Against Fifteen (15) ‘Agents’ of the UNITED STATES and its ‘DISTRICT COURT, et al’; and Against Which a ‘Default Judgment’ and a \$230 MILLION CLAIM ‘in Commerce’ has been Well-Established and is Now ‘In Collections’” as posted this past five (5) years without rebuttal with supporting EXHIBITS at:* [https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/111416\\_Orderto6thCircuit4EnBancReviewofQuoWarranto/](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/111416_Orderto6thCircuit4EnBancReviewofQuoWarranto/)

BENEFICIARY/RELATOR and Piersol refers to as a “*kidnapping*” and “*false incarceration*”<sup>31</sup> as confirmed by the five (5) irrefutable and un rebutted AFFIDAVITS located online since at least 2015 at:

[https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2017\\_StateofMichiganClaimofDamages/040317\\_PresentmentbyNotaryWitness/4-FiveAffidavitsofCourtWatchers.pdf](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2017_StateofMichiganClaimofDamages/040317_PresentmentbyNotaryWitness/4-FiveAffidavitsofCourtWatchers.pdf)

The above (and below) sets of RECORDS are matters of FACTS, not mere “*allegations*” or “*speculations*” as Piersol has attempted to have this EIGHTH CIRCUIT and the sovereign People at large believing.

Other THIRD-PARTY FACTUAL ACCOUNTS about the *domestic terrorism* taking place in the CHARTER COUNTY OF WAYNE and elsewhere in the STATE

---

<sup>31</sup> These acts were perpetrated by Michigan “*judicial usurper*” Karen Khalil that so “*shocked the conscious*” of onlookers that they can only be deemed “*domestic terrorist*” events.

See *also*, the court transcript, police report and other FACTUAL documents located at: [https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2017_StateofMichiganClaimofDamages/040317_PresentmentbyNotaryWitness/)

[Schied/2017\\_StateofMichiganClaimofDamages/040317\\_PresentmentbyNotaryWitness/](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2017_StateofMichiganClaimofDamages/040317_PresentmentbyNotaryWitness/) and at:

[https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/ExD\\_SwornNotarAffidDavidSchied.pdf](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/ExD_SwornNotarAffidDavidSchied.pdf)

See [https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2017\\_StateofMichiganClaimofDamages/040317\\_PresentmentbyNotaryWitness/8-HandwritCrimeRprt%26AffidbyDS.pdf](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2017_StateofMichiganClaimofDamages/040317_PresentmentbyNotaryWitness/8-HandwritCrimeRprt%26AffidbyDS.pdf)

See [https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/Exh\\_1\\_MyAffidavitofTruth.pdf](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/Exh_1_MyAffidavitofTruth.pdf)

See [https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/ExC\\_DaveLonier2ndAffidavitoDenialofRecords.pdf](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/ExC_DaveLonier2ndAffidavitoDenialofRecords.pdf)



OF MICHIGAN are available in twenty-three video testimonials placed into documentaries and posted for most of the past decade without rebuttal at:

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCd3xqk6Kc778ASLAsRpV5ag/videos>

The above video link details “*predicate*” crimes in 2017 by the conspiracy of CO-TRUSTEES of the “CITY OF NOVT” (police) and “52-1 DISTRICT COURT” (magistrates and judges), as well as by DTE ENERGY – which are being covered up at the “*secondary*” RICO levels by the CO-TRUSTEES of the STATE OF MICHIGAN – as provided at:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kkojn6BP3L0>

and,

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uOncdSeg1Xk>

The specific video detailing the crimes of judicial usurper Karen Khalil that are also being covered up by all THREE BRANCHES of that STATE is at:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u84rCiOYZhM>

The sworn DECLARATION of David Schied submitted to the “*co-trustees*” of the STATE and the UNITED STATES that conspired together CRIMINALLY to effect an EVICTION this past Winter upon a “*totally and permanently disabled quad-amputee*” is provided on the next page; and located in its entirety at:


[http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/101120\\_SchiedDeclarationUnderMoratorium-SIGNED.pdf](http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/101120_SchiedDeclarationUnderMoratorium-SIGNED.pdf)

**DECLARATION of David Schied (dated 10/15/20)**  
**Invoking the “Common Law” Jurisdiction**  
**and/or the “Federal” Jurisdiction in Halting Eviction**  
**via QUO WARRANTO, Notice of “INTENT TO LIEN”,**  
**Claims of “DISABILITY” and “MEDICAL FRAILITY”, and**  
**“To Prevent Further Spread of COVID-19”**

I, David Schied, an American man and a “quad-amputee” living within Michigan as one of the sovereign People of the United States of America, herein and hereby declare the following:

1. Since August 1, 2012, I have been an inhabitant of a home located at 46675 W. 12 Mile Road in the CITY OF NOVI, a municipality located in the COUNTY OF OAKLAND, in the STATE OF MICHIGAN.
2. Since November 2017, I have been living in the above-referenced home without any “Landlord-Tenant” contract whatsoever. Previously, no written contract for monthly rent had been established since that written in 2014 as a “month-to-month”, which expired in August 2015.
3. Any perceived ongoing “month-to-month” contract being in existence according to said property “owner” or “owners”, being Donald Thorpe and/or STATE BAR OF MICHIGAN crime syndicate and domestic terrorist network member Ava Ortner, are purely fictional, given as FACT that said “owners” nullified and VOIDED any and all contracts with me in November 2017 when supporting DTE ENERGY intervening in any such “expired month-to-month contract”. This occurred right after Thorpe and Ortner were clearly notified that DTE ENERGY was committing TERRORIST ACTS upon the sovereign People inhabiting this property – forcing me from the above-referenced home for a period of two weeks while unlawfully cutting power and rendering the home unusable without just consideration


I hereby certify and swear, in good faith, that the entirety of the sixty-one (61) numbered paragraphs above are true, accurate, and correct to the best of my understanding and belief.


  
Signature of Declarant

10/15/20  
Date

On this 15<sup>th</sup> day of OCTOBER 2020, before me, David Schied, personally appeared David Schied, known to me (or satisfactorily proven) whose name is subscribed to the within Declaration, in OAKLAND COUNTY of the STATE OF MICHIGAN.

In witness whereof, I hereunto set my hand and official Seal.

  
NOTARY PUBLIC



\_\_\_\_\_  
TITLE

My commission expires: 2-18-2026

Another sworn Affidavit of CLAIMS pertaining strictly to the liability of DTE ENERGY is at:

[https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2018\\_DTE%2BMICHIGAN/121517\\_NotaryPresentment/121517\\_DSAffidavit4NOL.pdf](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2018_DTE%2BMICHIGAN/121517_NotaryPresentment/121517_DSAffidavit4NOL.pdf)

Other EVIDENCE supporting those claims against *DTE ENERGY, et al.* is located at:

[https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2018\\_DTE%2BMICHIGAN/](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2018_DTE%2BMICHIGAN/)

Proper “*Discovery*” would have also produced another sampling of documents from 2017 **demonstrating the unsuccessful attempt to hold State and National governments accountable under the laws of the State and the United States.** They are categorized by **SIXTEEN “*examples*”** of solicitations for an appropriate responses to some set of facts by which criminal codes and statutes, the transparency laws, the Common Law, and/or the international Law of Commerce mandate that the so-called governments either act properly or be held to accountability for the consequences of their acts of gross negligence, malfeasance, and dishonor. <sup>32</sup>

These above-referenced “***Sixteen Examples***” are encapsulated in yet another publicly posted AFFIDAVIT called the “***DECLARATION OF TRUTH OF GRIEVANT/CLAIMANT DAVID SCHIED Concerning the Documentation***”

---

<sup>32</sup> This document is located today at: [http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/121117\\_DeclarofTruthon16ExampleCases.pdf](http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/121117_DeclarofTruthon16ExampleCases.pdf)



*of the Compounding of Racketeering Crimes by State and National Continuing Financial Crimes Organizations*” (11/27/17). These examples represent only one year of my attempts to reasonably communicate with the so-called “*powers that be.*”

Reviewers of this material should bear in mind that Beneficiary/Relator’s persistence in efforts to prove the acts of government “*usurpers*” as being unlawfully involved in protection rackets, as crime syndicates and “*continuing financial crimes organizations,*” extends back in documentation to late 2003. Hence, this represents just the latest year of reporting these types of crimes and recording what the so-called “*governments*” of the STATE and the UNITED STATES do with the information that is provided to them under mandate of accountability and compelling them to an appropriate response.

Note that for the duration of 2017, many of the documents referenced by this “*Declaration of Truth...*” are posted publicly at the following website link – which links to even more AFFIDAVITS validating even more supporting documents – which all remain without challenge by any of the named “*criminals*” or any “*official*” of the STATE ... that is, except and until they **ATTEMPTED TO MURDER Beneficiary/ Relator in March 2018:**

[https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2017\\_StateofMichiganClaimofDamages/2017\\_MI-DOS-DHS-DLARA&StateAdminBoard/](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2017_StateofMichiganClaimofDamages/2017_MI-DOS-DHS-DLARA&StateAdminBoard/)



**AFFIDAVIT OF TRUTH**

STATE OF MICHIGAN   )  
                                  )  
COUNTY OF OAKLAND )

I, David Schied, being the name "*Affiant*", declare that the above statements, as well as all referenced documents incorporated by reference and/or by attachment to this instant "DECLARATION OF TRUTH OF GRIEVANT/CLAIMANT DAVID SCHIED Concerning the Documentation of the Compounding of Racketeering Crimes by State and National 'Continuing Financial Crimes Organizations'", are hereby submitted under penalty of perjury as truthful, accurate, and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

If called to testify at legitimate *trial by jury* or *grand jury* proceedings, I will be able to reaffirm, verify, and clarify all of the above statements and accounting ledgers referenced herein in prosecution of the crimes about which I am reporting now and have been persistently reporting for this past full decade and a half since 2003 when I began to unravel the first of a long series of "*conspiracies of crimes*" being committed against me and against the People around me.


David Schied without prejudice                      Date: 12/11/17

Sworn to me this 11<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2017.

Pamela Persha

Notary Public, Oakland County, Michigan acting in Oakland County, Michigan.

My Commission expires: 2-18-2019



The above does not include the plethora of formalized “*CRIME REPORTS*” and “*CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS*” – filed not only by sworn affirmation, but also **submitted under criminal penalty** if proven as otherwise falsified – as found along with many more AFFIDAVITS at the following public posting URL: <sup>33</sup>

[https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/071415\\_MyResponse2MMRMA1stMot2Dismiss/071415\\_MyResponse2Mot2DismissinLieuofAnswer/](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/071415_MyResponse2MMRMA1stMot2Dismiss/071415_MyResponse2Mot2DismissinLieuofAnswer/)

More sworn AFFIDAVITS and judicial complaints revealing the FACTS – as presented *repeatedly* to U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL Loretta Lynch – are posted at:

[https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/083116\\_2ndCrimeReport2USAttorneyGeneralLynchonEvents%2BMagisCrime/Exhibits2AffidavitFollowUptoUSAGLynch/](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/083116_2ndCrimeReport2USAttorneyGeneralLynchonEvents%2BMagisCrime/Exhibits2AffidavitFollowUptoUSAGLynch/)

Additionally, when establishing CLAIMS against the \$100 BILLION “*[domestic] terrorism*” insurance rider of the CHARTER COUNTY OF WAYNE in 2016 as a PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL, Beneficiary/Relator submitted at least fourteen (14) more sworn AFFIDAVITS representing “*others similarly*

---

<sup>33</sup> The document filed with the USDCEM on 7/15/15 – submitted “**under penalty of perjury**” (i.e., see p. 136 of 138 total pages of the date-stamped PDF filing) – that fully explains the thirty-six (36) EXHIBITS at this referenced URL located at: [https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/071415\\_MyResponse2MMRMA1stMot2Dismiss/071415\\_MyResponse2Mot2DismissinLieuofAnswer/Response2Mot2Dismiss\\_EntireFinal.pdf](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEM/071415_MyResponse2MMRMA1stMot2Dismiss/071415_MyResponse2Mot2DismissinLieuofAnswer/Response2Mot2Dismiss_EntireFinal.pdf)

*situated*” as date-stamped by the USDCEDM on 3/31/16 and posted in that ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD this past five (5) years without challenging rebuttal at:

[https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/033116\\_PAGsSchied%26Squires\\_Joinderof-14-ClaimantsCrimeVictims/](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/033116_PAGsSchied%26Squires_Joinderof-14-ClaimantsCrimeVictims/)

|                                                                    |                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| <a href="#">CoverFiling&amp;MemorandumofLaw/</a>                   | 04-Mar-2019 08:10 |
| <a href="#">FileonDemand&amp;CertifofService/</a>                  | 04-Mar-2019 08:11 |
| <a href="#">Affidavit-2-HiramRobinson,Jr.pdf</a>                   | 30-Jun-2016 13:06 |
| <a href="#">Affidavit-CliffordStafford.pdf</a>                     | 30-Jun-2016 13:06 |
| <a href="#">Affidavit-Cornell.pdf</a>                              | 30-Jun-2016 13:06 |
| <a href="#">Affidavit-DebbieWilliams.pdf</a>                       | 30-Jun-2016 13:06 |
| <a href="#">Affidavit-EdNassar.pdf</a>                             | 30-Jun-2016 13:06 |
| <a href="#">Affidavit-GloriaJones.pdf</a>                          | 30-Jun-2016 13:06 |
| <a href="#">Affidavit-JamesFrankBowles.pdf</a>                     | 30-Jun-2016 13:06 |
| <a href="#">Affidavit-JamesWesleyHall.pdf</a>                      | 30-Jun-2016 13:06 |
| <a href="#">Affidavit-LynnetteWilliams.pdf</a>                     | 30-Jun-2016 13:06 |
| <a href="#">Affidavit-MailauniWilliams.pdf</a>                     | 30-Jun-2016 13:06 |
| <a href="#">Affidavit-ShannonDeBacker.pdf</a>                      | 30-Jun-2016 13:06 |
| <a href="#">Affidavit DavidEaston.pdf</a>                          | 30-Jun-2016 13:06 |
| <a href="#">Affidavit GraceTurnboe.pdf</a>                         | 30-Jun-2016 13:06 |
| <a href="#">AllAffidavitsCoverPagesTime-Stampedfiled033116.pdf</a> | 30-Jun-2016 13:06 |

Other significant FACTS summarily “*dismissed*” by Lawrence Piersol – without due process of “*discovery*” or “*litigation*” – detailing the **long history of David Schied as a crime fighter and victims’ rights activist** are located publicly posted in Beneficiary/Relator’s ever-growing “*ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD*” at the following link: [http://www.ricobusters.com/?page\\_id=527](http://www.ricobusters.com/?page_id=527)

The above link includes verifiable FACTS and a newly published autobiography of David Schied detailing not only his seventeen (17) year career in film and television, as well as his career as a writer and author of two (self) published



books, but also verified underlying “*backstory*”<sup>30</sup> of what started Beneficiary/Relator’s near twenty-years (20) of history documenting “*chain*” and “*wheel*” conspiracies <sup>31</sup> of crimes by government “*imposters*” and “*usurpers*” of the sovereign People’s Rights.

### **ARGUMENT – SUMMARY WITH DETAILS, CONTENTIONS, AND STANDARDS FOR REVIEW**

Note that all of the documents referenced within this “*Argument*” show beyond any reasonable doubt that the FACTS as presented above have been repeatedly submitted to previous “*courts*” and “*judges*” owned and/or operated and licensed by the “CO-TRUSTEES” (of the “*first case*”) calling themselves the “*STATE OF MICHIGAN*” and the “*UNITED STATES*”. These are cases in which proven FRAUD – in its various “*affirmative*” forms of *gross misrepresentations*

---

<sup>30</sup> See, [http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/111620\\_Letter2ProvostCanadaAA\\_SANDRAHARRIS-ALL.pdf](http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/111620_Letter2ProvostCanadaAA_SANDRAHARRIS-ALL.pdf)

<sup>31</sup> What is provided is more than a mere autobiography, because it includes insight, history, and **evidence of a lone American (as well as another “*targeted*” CRIME VICTIM, being a female American who is also a forensics specialist) who has been standing up for what is right against a long history of government corruption involving CORPORATE greed, seditious and treasonous FBI “*agents*” and high-ranking Washington, D.C. “*principals*” of the USDOJ, the “*Federal*” courts, and CONGRESSIONAL Legislators taking bribes from CORPORATE Lobbyists and corrupt, BILLION DOLLAR MEGA-CORPORATIONS and their crooked law firms. All of this history has involved the perpetuity of bureaucratic “*procedural*” coverup of “*substantive*” multi-levels of international terrorism funding and the engagement of high-stakes international art fraud.**

and/or *gross omissions* have dominated “*backward-looking-access-to-court*” cases causing not only a convoluting of the underlying ISSUES of each case, but also a compounding of the DAMAGES, just as has happened in this instant case, as well as the “*first case*”.

For these and other “*reasonable causes*” stated throughout this “BRIEF ON CLAIM AND APPEAL” <sup>32</sup>, all of these previously submitted “*Arguments*” – as well as their plethora of “Appendix[s] of EVIDENCE” and their “Table[s] of Authorities” <sup>33</sup> – to include all of the dated and unrebutted Affidavits and Declarations and Video Documentaries containing supported Witness and Victim Testimonials – of verifiable STATEMENT[s] of FACTS and HISTORY <sup>34</sup>, the well-researched, scholarly Memorandum(s), Amicus/Treatise, etc. and their

---

<sup>32</sup> Primarily these “*other reasonable causes*” are related to the MAXIM that “*Fraud vitiates everything...even judgments*”. See again, **Footnote #5**.

<sup>33</sup> See the TABLE OF AUTHORITIES of the two documents referenced by Footnotes #24 and #36 herein at minimum for those already provided to the UNITED STATES via its multi-faceted “U.S. DISTRICT COURTS” and its “SIXTH CIRCUIT” COA. (See also the instant “Table of Authorities” of this instant case.)

<sup>34</sup> This includes the scores of “*backward-looking*” case histories, the researched “History of the UNITED STATES”, as well as the referenced autobiographical histor[ies] of David Schied as referenced above, published publicly on the World Wide Web. It also includes numerous other video documentaries produced by more Sovereign American People through Common Law means depicting numerous CRIMES by the DEEP STATE “*powers that be*”, not the least of significance which is titled “*From JFK to 9/11: Everything is a Rich Man’s Trick*”, as located on 9/5/21 at: <https://www.bitchute.com/video/vsT4rOS03wXi/>

respective references to various other Arguments and Authorities – are incorporated within this ARGUMENT as if reiterated again herein verbatim.

With regard to Piersol's repeated assertion in the "first case" (Doc 14, p.27) that...

*"We rely on our public officials who have been entrusted with the responsibility to investigate such claims and to prosecute where appropriate."*

... it is well known that "*Separation of Powers*" was designed with the "responsibility of the Executive Branch to take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed", by "initiating and prosecuting criminal cases".<sup>35</sup>

**The Constitution "sought to divide the delegated powers of the new Federal Government into three defined categories, Legislative, Executive, and Judicial." *Bowsher v. Synar*, 478 U.S. 714, 721 (1986) (quoting *INS v. Chadha*, 462 U.S. 919, 951 (1983)). A primary constitutional responsibility of the Executive Branch is to "take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed." U.S. Const. Art. II, § 3. That responsibility has long been understood to encompass the responsibility for initiating and prosecuting criminal cases. *Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821, 832 (1985); *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 138 (1976) (per curiam); *United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. 683, 693 (1974).**

---

<sup>35</sup> See *John Robertson, Petitioner v. UNITED STATES, Ex Rel. Wykenna Watson*, 60 U. S. \_\_\_\_ (2010) No. 08-6261 as "*Brief for the UNITED STATES as AMICUS CURIAE supporting Respondent*"; as posted publicly at:

<http://www.ricobusters.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/RobertsonVUSexrelWatsoncase.pdf>



Yet time and time again, not only has such CRIMINAL *gross negligence* and *malfeasance* by the Executive Branch been demonstrated, but so too has the *gross negligence* and *malfeasance* of the Judicial Branch(es) of the STATE and UNITED STATES been FACTUALLY documented as covering up such “*prosecutorial abuses*”; thus, revealing compounded “*abuses of judicial discretion*” by the “CO-TRUSTEES” of the STATE OF MICHIGAN and the UNITED STATES (“*et alia*”).

Such documentation has been referenced by Beneficiary as falling under the doctrine of “*Backward-Looking-Access-To-Court*” (“BLAC”) cases, which includes this instant case of “*Schied v. U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, INC.*” being summarily “*dismissed*” along with the “*first case*”, in spite of all of the above being referenced therein.

Beneficiary has researched the authorities on BLAC cases and produced a 66-page “**MEMORANDUM OF LAW**” – which was date-stamped as “*received*” by the USDCEDM on 3/31/16 – that was “**BASED ON THE FIRST AMENDMENT PETITION CLAUSE AND EVIDENCE OF DOMESTIC TERRORISM**”. That document has been located publicly for the past five (5) years – without any challenge whatsoever – at:

[https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/033116\\_PAGsSchied%26Squires\\_Joinderof-14-ClaimantsCrimeVictims/CoverFiling%26MemorandumofLaw/MemorandumofLaw/MemorandumofLawonBLACclaimsonJoinderClaimants\\_ALL.pdf](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/033116_PAGsSchied%26Squires_Joinderof-14-ClaimantsCrimeVictims/CoverFiling%26MemorandumofLaw/MemorandumofLaw/MemorandumofLawonBLACclaimsonJoinderClaimants_ALL.pdf)

When such “*insurrection*” and “*domestic terrorism*” occur by those the Sovereign People have hired with “*fiduciary obligations*” under the PUBLIC TRUST to “*faithfully execute*” their DUTIES OF OFFICE in accordance with their OATHS OF OFFICES, **it is time for the “Masters” of these “public servants” to take back their sovereign Powers.** <sup>36</sup> This is when the Sovereign People exercise their own unique “*Common Law Jurisdiction*” as detailed in the “**MEMORANDUM OF LAW & JURISDICTION**” <sup>37</sup> and the “**MEMORANDUM ON RIGHTS OF (WE), 'THE PEOPLE'**”. <sup>38</sup>

With regard to Piersol summarily nullifying Beneficiary/Relator’s previous argument (in the *first case*) that ...

---

<sup>36</sup> See Beneficiary’s formalized “**Memorandum of Law...Pertaining to ‘Whether judicial ‘legislation’ is Constitutional’; and ‘whether judicial ‘independence’ authorizes ‘bad’ behavior’; and, ‘whether ‘substantive’ Evidence can be ‘procedurally’ stricken [or dismissed]’; and, ‘whether Evidence of a ‘Pattern and Practice’ of government coercion constitutes ‘Treason’ and/or ‘Domestic Terrorism’**” which was date-stamped as “*received*” by the USDCEDM on 11/18/15 and posted publicly this past five (5) years in the Beneficiary’s previously established ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD without challenge or rebuttal, located at: [https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015\\_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/083116\\_2ndCrimeReport2USAttnvGeneralLynchonEvents%2BMagisCrime/Exhibits2AffidavitFollowUptoUSAGLynch/EX\\_60\\_EntireMemorandumofLawinSupportInterlocutAppeal111815.pdf](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/2015_SchiedvJudgeKarenKhaliletalinUSDCEDM/083116_2ndCrimeReport2USAttnvGeneralLynchonEvents%2BMagisCrime/Exhibits2AffidavitFollowUptoUSAGLynch/EX_60_EntireMemorandumofLawinSupportInterlocutAppeal111815.pdf)

<sup>37</sup> This full nine (9) page “*memorandum*” dated 6/25/15, as submitted to the ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD in the case of “*Schied v. Khalil, et al*” is located online at: [https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/Exh\\_4\\_Memorandum%20Law%20%26%20Jurisdiction.pdf](https://constitutionalgov.us/sub/Michigan/Cases/David-Schied/Exh_4_Memorandum%20Law%20%26%20Jurisdiction.pdf)

<sup>38</sup> See **Footnote #11** above for previous reference to this document and its publicly posted location, also at: [http://www.ricobusters.com/?page\\_id=527](http://www.ricobusters.com/?page_id=527)

*“a Grand Jury should be empaneled, private prosecution should be allowed and initiated, and all Defendants should be arrested immediately and imprisoned pending a public hearing to answer Plaintiff's allegations” ...*

... by an unsupported “DENIAL” of “BENEFICIARY'S / RELATOR's  
OBJECTION TO SEALING OF CASE and MOTION TO SHOW CAUSE and  
DEMAND (OR ORDER) FOR FEDERAL SPECIAL GRAND JURY  
INVESTIGATION”, it is to be noted that the Sovereign People have retained such  
rights under the NINTH and TENTH AMENDMENTS as Scalia set into reminder  
when writing the majority ruling in United States v. Williams, 504 U.S. 36 (1992).

Further, the case of United States v. Smyth, 104 F.Supp. 283 (1952) well-  
addresses the FACT that although “*private prosecutions*” appear to be abandoned,  
the institution of grand jurors, themselves, “[have] *retain enough of this tradition*  
*that they may initiate prosecutions based on information received from persons who*  
*have no connection officially with them*”; and nothing in law prevents the Sovereign  
People from reinstituting this Common Law practice anytime they see a need.

Moreover, SCOTUS is well-familiar the Common Law “*Right*” – and the  
common law history and constitutional issues involved – in private prosecutions; as  
well as the conditions under which “*absolute immunity*” is to be provided to  
“*private*” prosecutors as well as to “*government*” prosecutors. Essentially, the  
critical element is not one’s governmental “*status*” but one’s “role” as an

“advocate” for the “Sovereign”, being the “government – of, by, and for – the People”.

In other words, whenever and whoever the person acting in the role is NOT acting in the sovereign People’s best interest, there is no “immunity” to be provided <sup>39</sup>, as Piersol and his “judicial imposter” predecessors and “peer group” of cohorts refuse to admit as *insurrectionists* and *domestic terrorists*.

*“When private individuals undertake an action, such as prosecution, that is ‘traditionally associated with sovereignty,’ they are deemed state actors exercising sovereign power and thus become subject to constitutional constraints.” Jackson, 419 U.S. at 352-353.* <sup>40</sup>

*“At common law, ‘the better practice’ was ‘to institute an independent action in the name of the state’ even when it was conducted by private counsel.”* <sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> *supra*. See again, *John Robertson, Petitioner v. UNITED STATES, Ex Rel. Wykenna Watson* as it cites William Blackstone, *Commentaries* \*2, “The Constitution’s use of terms such as ‘crime,’ ‘offense,’ and ‘criminal prosecution’ must be understood in light of their common law heritage ... [whereby] ‘the proper prosecutor for every public offence’ [was] “the sovereign”. ... “Although the Constitution itself does not define these terms, their meaning is illuminated by common law traditions at the time the Constitution was drafted and ratified. See *Crawford v. Washington*, 541 U.S. 36, 42-50 (2004)” ... “[T]he Constitution’s common-law background suggests that the Framers understood a ‘crime’ as ... a breach and violation of the public rights and duties due to the whole community, considered as a community... an injury to the public [;] ... and [understood ] a ‘criminal prosecution’ as a response taken on the public’s behalf” (regardless of whether the person had the status as a “public” or a “private” prosecutor.

This is the underlying basis, therefore, for Beneficiary/Relator referring to himself by the Common Law term, “Private. Public Proxy”.

<sup>40</sup> *Jackson v. Metropolitan Edison Co.*, 419 U.S. 345 (1974)

<sup>41</sup> High, James L. *A Treatise on the Law of Injunctions* § 1449, at 1460 (4th ed. 1905).

Thus, Piersol's statement, "[t]he Court adhered to the principle that the accurate determination of guilt or innocence requires the exercise of judgment by a prosecutor" creates a genuine issue of FACT triable by a JURY... one which has been repeatedly DENIED to Beneficiary by the listed CO-TRUSTEES of the STATE OF MICHIGAN and the UNITED STATES ("et alia"), as well as many yet unnamed "DOES". All of the above thus, applies to BOTH the "*first case*" and this instant "*second case*" in which Piersol's "*summary actions*" precluded the "*principal*" of U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, INC. and its "*Agents*" numbered as DOES 1-16 (of a total of 20) even being "*served*" with notice that they were being sued in this case.

### **SHORT CONCLUSION WITH PRECISE RELIEF SOUGHT/DEMANDED**

It should be amply clear that Beneficiary David Schied is technology-savvy, tenacious, dedicated, and committed enough to keep the TRUTH "*on the table*" in spite of the attempts of government "*actors*" to repeatedly "*strike*" and "*dismiss*" the TRUTH from their records while generating a plethora of additional fraudulence to their "official" record history.

As such, the "*repeated redress*" has resulted in "*repeated* [and compounded] *injuries*", which have been also repeatedly compounded in "*TREBLE DAMAGES*",

now surmounting \$918 BILLION (in the first case alone) and over \$ 225,000 (in this instant second case) as the now updated “*Demand(s) for Relief*”. <sup>42</sup>

“*Relief*” is also demanded in the “*first case*” to include the ORDER for “*The Accused*” – to include the herein named alleged *judicial usurpers* – to surrender their “*corpus*” for imprisonment until such times as a “*speedy*” TRIAL BY JURY is executed; and/or, until “*performance bonds*” of these “*fiduciary agents*” – subject to OATHS and DUTIES of offices of the PUBLIC TRUST – are identified and surrendered to Beneficiary as the Sovereign Peoples’ “*private prosecutor*” with his own ARTICLE III COURT OF RECORD.

In this instant “*second case*”, it may suffice to simply inform the principal “*Executives*” and “*Board*” members – e.g., by DECLARATORY ORDER – that certain criminal allegations exist and provide them the opportunity to “*present their defense*” against the “*civil*” allegations herein first...”*in the interest of fairness and justice*”.

Truthfully submitted,

/s/ David Schied      Date: 9/20/21

DISABLED / BENEFICIARY  
David Schied  
P.O. Box 321  
SPEARFISH, S. DAKOTA 57783  
605-580-5121 (all calls recorded)

<sup>42</sup> This amount – even as was originally demanded in the amount of \$306 BILLION in the “*first case*” – is anything but “*frivolous*”, given that the “*allegations*” amount to an indictment of the entire “*Administrative State*” of the EXECUTIVE and JUDICIAL “*branches*”; which need a complete revamping to reinstate “*honest government services*” via public hearings on violations of the U.S. CONSTITUTION and the RULES ENABLING ACT.



**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE [Rule 32(g)(1)]**

This is to certify that this “*APPEAL BRIEF*” complies with FRAP Rule 32(a)(7)(B) since it contains a maximum of 11,690 words, as determined by the MS WORD/OFFICE 365 program of the MICROSOFT CORPORATION.

Page 85 of 85      11690 words

---

**(7) Length.**

**(A) Page Limitation.** A principal brief may not exceed 30 pages, or a reply brief 15 pages, unless it complies with Rule 32(a)(7)(B).

**(B) Type-Volume Limitation.**

**(i) A principal brief is acceptable if it:**

- contains no more than 13,000 words; or

The word count excludes any words provided in graphics that has been embedded in reference to undeniable EVIDENCE of an OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE by the lower court “*actors*” secondary coverup of predicate RICO crimes by their “*peer group*” of other “*government*” criminals – in the “first case” captioned as “*David Schied v. UNITED STATES, et alia*” – who are referenced herein as “*insurrectionists*” and “*domestic terrorists*”.

Truthfully submitted,

/s/ David Schied

Date: 9/20/21

|                                                                                                                           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| DISABLED / BENEFICIARY<br>David Schied<br>P.O. Box 321<br>SPEARFISH, S. DAKOTA 57783<br>605-580-5121 (all calls recorded) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|