

OCT -7 P 4:04

KMT 367

In The
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

GEORGE E. McDERMOTT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDP SUPREME
IN ALL CASES BUT DENIED

PETITIONER

10 - 10236

VS.

CASE_10-A662

KENNETH J. MACFAYDEN; JAMES J. LOFTUS
MARIAM M. FUCHS, JEFF HOUSTON.

ALSO CASE NUMBER
10 - 8196 ALSO DISMISSED
WITH SHAM UNSIGNED
UNCONSTITUTIONAL ORDER

RESPONDENT'S

PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR THE COURT TO CERTIFY UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY, THE NAMES OF THE INDIVIDUAL JUDGES AUTHORIZING THIS CLERK'S OFFICE TO DISMISS CASE WITH UNSIGNED UNCONSTITUTIONAL ORDER IN VIOLATION OF MARYLAND CONSTITUTION ARTICLE 4 SECTION 1. AND INCORPORATED MOTION FOR THE COURT TO PRODUCE FOR COPYING AND INSPECTION THE JUDICIAL OATHS OF OFFICE OF EACH INDIVIDUAL JUDGE OF THIS COURT AND THE COURT CLERK'S COMPLIANCE WITH THEIR SWORN ALLEGIANCE TO OUR CONSTITUTION

Comes now, George McDermott through the motion process, requesting/demanding the clerk of the court identify all the justices taking part in the denial of constitutional and statutory relief in the two above cases which were purportedly ruled upon By the Court, October 3 2011. As each judge of this court was petitioned to take judicial notice of the Constitution of the state of Maryland; and having been notified by certified registered mail that noncompliance would result in a complaint of civil and criminal conspiracy against the justices of this court for violating the legal and constitutional rights of American citizens under color of law and authority.¹

¹ Void Orders Can Be Attacked At Any Time

An order that exceeds the jurisdiction of the court, is void, or voidable, and can be attacked in any proceeding in any court where the validity of the judgment comes into issue. (See *Rose v. Himely* (1808) 4 Cranch 241, 2 L ed 608; *Pennoyer v. Neff* (1877) 95 US 714, 24 L ed 565; *Thompson v. Whitman* (1873) 18 Wall 457, 21 L ed 897; *Windsor v. McVeigh* (1876) 93 US 274, 23 L ed 914; *McDonald v. Mabee* (1917) 243 US 90, 37 Sct 343, 61 L ed 608.

William Suter, nor this court can deny that the pleadings put forth before this court showed grave constitutional questions regarding this court's compliance with the Constitution and rule of law of this nation. The Washington Times reporting. Testimony given by Justices Anthony Scalia and Justice Stephen B. Souter making outlandish public statements and I quote ("I'm hoping the living Constitution will die." Justice Scalia said.) The justices revealed were astounding facts on the public record. The mechanism of judicial accountability is flawed and unfair to the majority of American citizens. ("On Wednesday, the justices explain some of the criteria they used in deciding which of the 9000 or so annual appeals they will consider. They said the key is often a disagreement among lower courts, which usually signals that a law is unclear and can be interpreted differently. The court/field whittled down those appeals to 77 cases they decide annually.") [Att 3].

Petitioner asserts that based on the number used by Justices in the public hearing of 9000 or so petitions supplied to the court annually. This court clerk's office is submitting roughly 8923 sham unsigned orders in conflict with the Constitution and oath of office, that the justices of this court and the clerk of this Court swore to uphold and defend. This equates to 8923 or so violations of Title 18 of the United States criminal code to, and unless the court can provide authenticated proof that petitioner and others were given their minimum due process of rights at law by these 9 Supreme Court justices, operating under a purported cloak of judicial immunity, in a shroud of secrecy as the justices admit, in an unprofessional, unconstitutional methodology giving preference to corporate America and special interest over the constitutional rights and liberties of our citizens, under color of law and authority

. In summation, the court is in breach of contract by providing substandard poor and inadequate services of justices who knowingly of their free will signed and attested to their oath

of office to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, just as the justices of the Maryland courts have done [Att. 4] which was recently validated by the Maryland secretary of state and attested to. If this court clerks office does not know the location of the original signed oaths of office and what the cost is of such records, it would be advisable that this court shutdown until such documents can be located and verified. Petitioner also requests that the court clerk identify the party or entity, or governmental agency that covers the judicial bond for federal judges and Supreme Court judges also court personnel operating outside of their oath of office and job description under color of law and authority. Petitioner will wait to courts response. While formulating a motion to reconsider based on the fact that attested copies of the courts of appeals judges verified that a fraud has been committed on this court and the petitioner.

Respectfully submitted,


Petitioner George E. McDermott

143 N. Huron Dr.

forest Heights, Maryland

20745

301-839-5816 cell 301-996-9577

Attachments

1. Noncomplying order Of the Court, October third 2011
2. Formal request to the Maryland Secretary of State for judicial signatures
3. Washington Times front-page story October 3, 2011 In Hill testimony
4. Secretary of State's compliance with constitutional request