ORIGINAL

US BANKRUPTCY COURT
APR 1 2015
RECEIVED

SUPREME "COURT" OF OHIO

r-lotus:justice
The Great Republic of America,
Union of Sovereign States,
united States of America,

Case No.: 15-0303

Plaintiffs,

v.

"UNITED STATES" et al,
STATE OF OHIO, et al,
FRANKLIN COUNTY MUNICIPAL "COURT",
FRANKLIN COUNTY "COURT" OF COMMON PLEAS,
FRANKLIN COUNTY SHERIFFS OFFICE, et al,
CITY OF COLUMBUS, et al,
MONICA GREER JUSTICE, et al,

Defendants.

NOTICE OF FILING 2

The Plaintiffs lay upon the bar this NOTICE of the attached filing in an alternate court.

FILED
APR 01 2015
CLERK OF COURT
SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

r-lotus:justice, ARR
Lawful Executor for LOTUS, et al,
Private Attorney general & Executor de Son Tort for the Great Republic of America, the Union of Sovereign States of America and the united States of America.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The Defendants stated herein the attached document shall receive a copy of this document and the attached document delivered by "United States" Postal Service delivery, a third party courier or personal service.

r-lotus:justice, ARR

FILED
MAR 20 2015
CLERK OF COURT
SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

Oath of Certified Copy

On this 18 day of MAR of 2015 I, the undersigned Notary Public, has compared the original and the copies and certify under penalty of perjury under the Laws of the Republic for the united States of America that said attached copies are exact duplicates to the original.

Grace A. Terry

Notary Public Signature

2-15-16

My Commission Expires

NOTARIAL SEAL STATE OF OHIO

GRACE A. TERRY
Notary Public, State of Ohio
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES 02-15-16

US BANKRUPTCY COURT
MAR 12 2015
RECEIVED

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
COLUMBUS, OHIO

r-lotus:justice,	)	
	)	**Case No.:**
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
stephen-l:mcintosh	)	
Franklin County Common Pleas "Court"	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

---

1. Petitioner r-lotus:justice, by and through her Next Friend, respectfully requests this Court reconsider the Petitioner's *PETITON FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS,* incorporated as if fully rewritten herein, (hereafter *PETITION*) due to an error by assumption by the Court. Petitioner was unlawfully arrested and incarcerated and is currently being held in violation of her Constitutional Rights, God given and inalienable; pursuant to an order by "Judge" stephen-l:mcintosh.

2. The Court assumed the *PETITION* was related to a previous case, 2:07-bk-53499, which it is not. The Court has misconstrued the *PETITION* in that the *PETITION* is a <u>new</u> filing and in no way related to the 2007 bankruptcy case. Dismissal claiming the "Pleading was filed in a close[d] case" was in error.

JURISDICTION

3. Petitioner r-lotus:justice once again addresses the jurisdiction in this action pursuant to the Bankruptcy Act of 1898, §9, *Protection and Detention of Bankrupts.* Petitioner r-lotus:justice further brings this action pursuant to Article I, §9 and Article III of the Constitution for the united States of American circa 1812, as well as the Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Amendments to the Constitution for the united States of American circa 1812, 28 U.S.C. §2241 et seq. (including 28 U.S.C. §2254), and all other applicable law. The Suspension Clause protects "the writ as it existed in 1789," that is, as a writ which federal judges could issue in the exercise of their 'Common Law' authority. (See *Boumedinene v. Bush*, 553 U.S. 723 (2008)). The authority of federal courts to review the claims of prisoners in state custody is clearly established in 28 U.S.C. § 2254 granting federal courts that authority in 1867, as part of the post-Civil War Reconstruction. In the case of *Waley v. Johnson,* 316 U.S. 101 (1942), the U.S. Supreme Court interpreted this authority broadly to allow the writ to be used to challenge convictions or sentences in violation of a defendant's Constitutional Rights where no other remedy was available.

4. Petitioner r-lotus:justice believes this is the proper Court to hear this matter where the status of the Petitioner is not being addressed pursuant to the Bankruptcy Act of 1898 and documents presented to the lower purported "courts" have gone without response.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

5. The Petitioner r-lotus:justice, a real flesh and blood Wo(man) acting *in propria persona,* is the creditor/beneficiary in this matter and has been "misidentified" as

MONICA GREER JUSTICE, the surety/debtor in the actions brought forth against her. The Petitioner was coerced by threats and intimidation to initiate a claim of Equity in Bankruptcy pursuant to the Bankruptcy Act of 1898 as the Preferred Creditor and lawful Executor for the *cestui que* trust's commercial instrument, the person/PERSON, Monica Greer Justice/MONICA GREER JUSTICE, against said commercial instrument and Trust in order to affect and effect the Petitioner's release from unlawful bondage. No charges have been brought against r-lotus:justice to wit.

6. Petitioner r-lotus:justice is the party for whom the *PETITION* is intended and prosecuted. Petitioner has been relocated from the Franklin County Jail to the Ohio Reformatory for Women in Marysville, Ohio.

7. Petitioner r-lotus:justice, being a real flesh and blood Wo(man) and peaceful inhabitant of the Land, standing in the Law of the Land, The Common Law, and standing under the Will of the People, the Constitution for the Republic for the united States of America, **demands a probable cause hearing in remedy** saved pursuant to the Judicial Act of 1789, the Savings to Suitors Clause and the Bankruptcy Act of 1898, and other law cited above.

8. Petitioner r-lotus:justice, was arrested and incarcerated on January 27, 2015 after bond was revoked by "Judge" stephen-l:mcintosh on January 9, 2015. The bond was revoked because the Petitioner refused to abdicate her Fifth and Sixth Amendment rights and her "standing" in The Common Law and to submit to a presentence investigation to obtain "parol" evidence without the protections of witness, of counsel recorder of record or recording devise in apposition to the F.R.C.P. 32(c)(2), "the probation officer who interviews a defendant as part of a presentence investigation

must, on request, give the defendant's attorney notice and a reasonable opportunity to attend the interview." . The Petitioner's queries to the purported "court", FRANKLIN COUNTY COMMON PLEAS COURT, in case number 14CR1581 have gone unanswered, either by neglect or inability to answer with specificity as to which jurisdiction in Law is being invoked. Petitioner's status has not been challenged.

9. Whereas the purported "courts" of law as private banks, have never established upon the bar and the public record venue, subject matter and personal jurisdiction in the causes at the bar as required pursuant to The Common Law, the Constitution for the united States of America and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Ohio rules of Civil Procedure, the "courts" are barred by Estoppels and fraud from moving forward in the causes at bar. This has not prevented the purported "courts" and the actors under 'color of law' from moving forward and acting with complete disregard for the Rule of Law.

10. "Once jurisdiction is challenged, the court cannot proceed when it clearly appears that the court lacks jurisdiction, the court has no authority to reach merits, but, rather, should dismiss the action." *Melo v. US*, 505 F2d 1026.

11. "The law requires proof of jurisdiction to appear on the record of the administrative agency and all administrative proceedings." *Hagans v. Lavine*, 415 U. S. 533.

12. A judgment rendered by a court without personal jurisdiction over the defendant is void. It is a nullity. *Sramek v. Sramek*, 17 Kan. App. 2d 573, 576-77, 840 P.2d 553 (1992), rev. denied 252 Kan. 1093 (1993).

13. "The law provides that once State and Federal Jurisdiction has been challenged, it must be proven." *Maine v. Thiboutot*, 100 S. Ct. 2502 (1980).

14. "**Jurisdiction**, once challenged, **cannot be assumed** and **must be decided**." *Maine v Thiboutot,* 100 S. Ct. 2502 (1980). (Emphasis added)

15. "The burden shifts to the court to prove jurisdiction." *Rosemond v. Lambert*, 469 F2d 416.

16. "There is no discretion to ignore that lack of jurisdiction." *Joyce v. US*, 474 F2d 215.

17. For the purported "court" to have proceeded was in effect depriving the Petitioner of multiple Constitutional Rights and was acting in "excess of jurisdiction" which is fatal to the STATE'S cause.

18. "Where a court failed to observe safeguards, it amounts to denial of due process of law, court is deprived of juris." *Merritt v. Hunter*, C.A. Kansas 170 F2d 739.

19. "A court cannot confer jurisdiction where none existed and cannot make a void proceeding valid. **It is clear and well established law that a void order can be challenged in any court.**" *Old Wayne Mut. L. Assoc. v. McDonough*, 204 U. S. 8, 27 S. Ct. 236 (1907). (Emphasis added)

20. The orders of the purported "court", FRANKLIN COUNTY COMMON PLEAS "COURT", are null and void ab initio.

21. The Petitioner r-lotus:justice, by and through incorporeal hereditaments, is the Grantor of the Trust and a Preferred/Priority Creditor pursuant to the Bankruptcy Act of 1898. Petitioner has been arrested and is being held as the "Bankrupt". Petitioner has been placed in forced involuntary bankruptcy as a Preferred/Priority Creditor. The Petitioner is neither a "Bankrupt" nor a 14th Amendment "civilly dead" entity but rather a lawful "Executor" for the commercial instrument, the person/PERSON, Monica Greer Justice/MONICA GREER JUSTICE.

22. Additional facts and issues presented in the *PETITION* are hereby incorporated in this *REQUEST* as if fully rewritten herein.

23. The Men and Wo(men) as agents for the purported "courts" of law as private banks, are attempting to unlawfully affect and effect a forced bankruptcy pursuant to the

bankruptcy Act of 1898 by using threat, duress, deceit, fictio, fraud and acts of Sedition and Treason.

24. The real Wo(men), r-lotus:justice, with the lawful right by lineage and hereditaments to inherit the Perfect Usufruct and the *cestui que* trust derived thereof and created by the Bankruptcy Act of 1898, was unlawfully taken by highway men/pirates, pursuant to the Lieber Code, operating as agents for the purported "courts" of law as private banks.

25. The FRANKLIN COUNTY "COURTS" have identified the Petitioner as a "Sovereign" as demonstrated by the "courts" own documentation. (See Exhibit 1 as incorporated and fully rewritten herein.) Whereas FRANKLIN COUNTY has made that determination, and whereas FRANKLIN COUNTY has placed no documentation upon the bar to challenge their assertion of Sovereignty, pursuant to decisions by the supreme Court of the united States of America, the lower purported "courts" cannot apply statutes to the Sovereign without their consent.

26. The People v. Herkimer, 4 Cowen (NY) 345, 348 (1825):

"The people, or sovereign are not bound by general words in statutes, restrictive of prerogative right, title or interest, unless expressly named. Acts of limitation do not bind the King or the people. The people have been ceded all the rights of the King, the former sovereign ... It is a maxim of the common law, that when an act is made for the common good and to prevent injury, the King shall be bound, though not named, but when a statute is general and prerogative right would be divested or taken from the King [or the people] he shall not be bound."

27. "Since in common usage, the term 'person' does not include the sovereign, statutes employing the phrase are ordinarily construed to exclude it." United States v. Fox, 94 USS 315,

28. "There is an old and well-known rule that statutes which in general terms divest pre-existing rights or privileges will not be applied to the sovereign without express words to that effect. And - "The Act does not define 'persons.' In common usage that term does not include the sovereign, and statutes employing it will ordinarily not be construed to do so." United States v Mine Workers, 330 US 258 [1947] "[I]n common

usage, the term `person' does not include the sovereign, [and] statutes employing the phrase are ordinarily construed to exclude it." United States v. Cooper Corp., 312 U.S. 600, 604 [1941;] accord, United States v. Mine Workers, 330 U.S. 258, 1947.]

29. Where is the jurisdiction of FRANKLIN COUNTY? It does not appear in the record? The jurisdiction of the purported "court" was not properly established and any orders rendered by that court are null and void.

30. Jurisdiction, once challenged, is to be proven, not by the court, but by the party attempting to assert jurisdiction. The burden of proof of jurisdiction lies with the asserter. The court is only to rule on the sufficiency of the proof tendered. See *McNutt v. GMAC*, 298 US 178. (Emphasis added) (Under § 5 of the Act of March 3, 1875, Jud.Code, § 37, 28 U.S.C. 80, a plaintiff in the District Court must plead the essential jurisdictional facts and must carry throughout the litigation the burden of showing that he is properly in court; if his allegations of jurisdictional facts are challenged by his adversary in any appropriate manner, he must support them by competent proof, and, even where they are not so challenged, the court may insist that the jurisdictional facts be established by a preponderance of evidence, or the case be dismissed.)

The origins of this doctrine of law may be found in *Maxfield's Lessee v. Levy*, 4 US 330.

31. Furthermore, the purported "court", FRANKLIN COUNTY COMMON PLEAS "COURT", during the trial and examination of witnesses by the Petitioner, removed the jury then threatened, intimidated, and coerced witnesses with contempt and incarceration if they did not provide their Social Security Account Numbers (SSAN) to the prosecution. One witness was held in custody for nearly 30 minutes until he could contact someone to get his SSAN. The Privacy Act of 1974 protects an individual from improper requests for disclosure of their SSAN and requires a 'Disclosure Statement' be provided by the person or agency requesting the information. The demand by the FRANKLIN COUNTY COMMON PLEAS "COURT" was an intentional tort and violation of federal law. (See Exhibit 2, attached and incorporated as if fully rewritten herein.)

32. The U.S. Supreme Court, in *Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 U.S. 232, 94 S.Ct. 1683, 1687 (1974) stated that "when a state officer acts under a state law in a manner

violative of the Federal Constitution, he "comes into conflict with the superior authority of that Constitution, and he is in that case stripped of his official or representative character and is subjected *in his person* to the consequences of his individual conduct. The State has no power to impart to him any immunity from responsibility to the supreme authority of the United States." [Emphasis supplied in original].

33. Judgment is a void judgment if court that rendered judgment lacked jurisdiction of the subject matter, or of the parties, or acted in a manner inconsistent with due process, Fed. Rules Civ. Proc., Rule 60(b)(4), 28 U.S.C.A., U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 5 - *Klugh v. U.S.*, 620 F.Supp. 892 (D.S.C. 1985).

34. Under Federal law which is applicable to all states, the U.S. Supreme Court stated that if a court is "without authority, its judgments and orders are regarded as nullities. They are not voidable, but simply void; and form no bar to a recovery sought, even prior to a reversal in opposition to them. They constitute no justification; **and all persons concerned in executing such judgments or sentences, are considered, in law, as trespassers**." *Elliot v. Piersol*, 1 Pet. 328, 340, 26 U.S. 328, 340 (1828) (Emphasis added)

35. The Court in *Yates v. Village of Hoffman Estates*, Illinois, 209 F.Supp. 757 (N.D. Ill. 1962) held that "not every action by a judge is in exercise of his judicial function. ... it is not a judicial function for a judge to commit an intentional tort even though the tort occurs in the courthouse." **When a judge acts as a trespasser of the law, when a judge does not follow the law, the judge loses subject-matter jurisdiction and the judges orders are void, of no legal force or effect.** (Emphasis added)

36. Furthermore, in 1977, the United States Supreme Court in *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. 817 (1977), ruled that prisons were required to provide access to people trained in law or law library collections in order to meet the constitutional requirement of meaningful access to the courts. The Petitioner, as an *in propria persona* litigant, has been denied meaningful access to legal research, access to legal assistants, deprived of necessary instruments to prepare documents, and loss of documents, research and property during the transfer from Franklin County Jail to the Ohio Reformatory for Women in Marysville, Ohio. This lack of access is denying the Petitioner due process, proper access to the courts and is adversely affecting the Petitioner's right to appeal the injustices perpetrated by the purported "courts" of FRANKLIN COUNTY.

37. The Petitioner, while in the custody of the Franklin County Jail, was assaulted by another inmate causing head injuries, herniated discs and broken ribs. The Petitioner was denied proper medical attention for over a week and is still being denied proper medical attention to address the injuries.

DEMAND FOR RELIEF

38. Pursuant to the foregoing, whereas the Petitioner has been unlawfully incarcerated, the Petitioner requests this Court reconsider her *PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS* and at a minimum grant the Petitioner's Writ of Habeas Corpus or provide the Petitioner a hearing to present her arguments.

39. "It is most true that this Court will not take jurisdiction if it should not: but it is equally true, that it must take jurisdiction if it should. The judiciary cannot, as the legislature may, avoid a measure because it approaches the confines of the constitution. We cannot pass it by because it is doubtful. With whatever doubts, with whatever difficulties, a case may be attended, we must decide it, if it be brought before us. We have no more right to decline the exercise of jurisdiction which is given, than to usurp that which is not given. The one or the other would be treason to the constitution. Questions may occur which we would gladly avoid; but we cannot avoid them. All we can do is, to exercise our best judgment, and conscientiously to perform our duty. In doing this, on the present occasion, we find this tribunal invested with appellate jurisdiction in all cases arising under the constitution and laws of the United States. We find no exception to this grant, and we cannot insert one." *Cohens v. Virginia*, 19 U.S. 264, 404, 5 L.Ed. 257, 6 Wheat. 264 (1821)

40. This *in propria persona* Petitioner request this court vacate the orders from the FRANKLIN COUNTY COMMON PLEAS "COURT" and that they be determined to be in violation of the United States Constitution for reasons which arise from the facts of his case and order the release of Petitioner forthwith and other such relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

41. Petitioner reserves the right to amend this Request at any time.

For: r-lotus:justice
Sui Juris
P.O. Box 82251
Columbus, Ohio the State

Currently incarcerated at the
Ohio Reformatory for Women
c/o justice, # 91619
1479 Collins Avenue
Marysville, Ohio 43040

By: Next Friend
michael-anthony:galluzzo
Contact address:
P.O. Box 82251
Columbus, Ohio the State

As Next Friend in this matter, I attest that the statements made herein are true and accurate to the best of my belief and affirm under oath under penalty of perjury by the laws of the united States of America pursuant to Title 28 USC, section 1746.

michael-anthony:galluzzo

michael-anthony:galluzzo, Next Friend, ARR

Signed in my presence by michael-anthony:galluzzo on March 11, 2015.

Ohio the State:

Franklin County:

My Commission Expires: 3-9-19

MARINA OSIPOVA
Notary Public, State of Ohio
My Commission Expires 03-09-19

A161 - E51 REPORT: CT1122 FRANKLIN COUNTY JUSTICE SYSTEM PAGE: 9
Franklin County Ohio Clerk of Courts of the Common Pleas- 2014 Apr 09 4:37 PM-13CR001483

REPORT OF ARRAIGNMENT PROCEEDINGS - CRIMINAL DIVISION

PROCESS DATE: 03/27/14

FILED
COMMON PLEAS COURT
FRANKLIN CO. OHIO
2014 MAR 31 PM 3:08
CLERK OF COURTS-CV

COURTROOM: 2B BATCH NO: HC001
DATE: 03/31/14 TIME: 0100 PM

JUDGE:
CLERK:
REPTR:

CASE NO DEFENDANT

Keating 87252

14CR-03-1574 SLONE, ROBERT W.
SS#[redacted] RACE: W DOB: 03/04/78
3F
01 2913 51 F4 RCVNG STOLEN PROPRTY
02 2913 51 F5 RCVNG STOLEN PROPRTY

TRIAL:
PLEA: NG
CONT.TO:
CAPIAS:
BF&CAPIAS: 3000 A
BOND: 2000 R

Jewett 79534

14CR-03-1575 DAVIS, TAJ H.
SS#[redacted] RACE: B DOB: 09/13/90
6E
01 2950 06 F3 FAILURE TO VERIFY CURRENT
Prob/Serrott
12CR5855

TRIAL:
PLEA: NG
CONT.TO:
CAPIAS:
BF&CAPIAS: 5000 A
BOND: 5000 R

Already Assigned - Hunt

14CR-03-1576 BROBST, BRIAN E.
SS#[redacted] RACE: W DOB: 05/01/88
6A
01 2911 11 F1 AGGRAVATED BURGLARY

TRIAL:
PLEA: NG
CONT.TO:
CAPIAS: 50000 S
BF&CAPIAS: 50 000 A
BOND: 20000 R

Farnese 81696

14CR-03-1579 SHERMAN, KEDEEM L.
SS#[redacted] RACE: B DOB: 02/27/90
01 2950 05 F3 FAILURE TO PROVIDE NTC CH
5E

TRIAL:
PLEA: NG
CONT.TO:
CAPIAS:
BF&CAPIAS: 7000 A
BOND: 5000 R

Graceffo 65930

14CR-03-1581 JUSTICE, MONICA G.
SS#[redacted] RACE: W DOB: 01/06/67
4B
01 2903 13 F4 ASSAULT
Sovereign

TRIAL:
PLEA: NG per Judge
CONT.TO:
CAPIAS: 100,000 S
BF&CAPIAS:
BOND: 2000 R

Murnane 86777

14CR-03-1582 ELLER, TIMOTHY A.
SS#[redacted] RACE: W DOB: 06/24/70
01 2921 34 F3 ESCAPE
Prob/Holbrook
13CR 2031
13CR 3979
5B

TRIAL:
PLEA: NG
CONT.TO:
CAPIAS: 5000 S
BF&CAPIAS: 4000 A
BOND: 5000 R

Exhibit 1

JW

AFFIDAVIT and VERIFICATION
of
Michael Anthony Galluzzo

State Ohio)
) ss:
County of Champaign)

I, Michael Anthony Galluzzo, being first duly cautioned and sworn, do hereby depose and aver as follows:

1) I am of sound mind and legal age;
2) I am a real flesh and blood Sovereign of the Great Republic of the United States of America, a natural inhabitant of Champaign County in the Republic state Ohio;
3) I am not a fiction in law, not a 14th Amendment citizen of the *federal corporation* dba the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, nor a "United States" citizen;
4) I stand in the Law of the Land, the Common Law, standing with the Will of the People, in the Constitution for the United States of America, the Great Republic, and its immutable Grants of un-alienable rights and reserve all rights therein;
5) I stand in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, a compact between the original States and the people and States in the territory which shall forever remain unalterable and reserve all rights therein;
6) I reserve all rights pursuant to the savings to suitors clause and the Uniform Commercial Code, specifically UCC 1-308.
7) I, Michael Anthony Galluzzo, aver that I was served a subpoena to testify in the matter brought against MONICA GREER JUSTICE, Case No. 14 CR 1581, in the COMMON PLEAS COURT of FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO commencing on September 29, 2014.
8) The proceedings took place in the FRANKLIN COUNTY COMMON PLEAS COURTHOUSE at 345 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio in Courtroom 4B, Rm. 4804.

Exhibit 2

9) Judge Stephen L. McIntosh (hereafter Judge McIntosh) presided over the hearing.

10) John P. Graceffo (hereafter A.P. Graceffo) was the assistant prosecutor for the plaintiff, STATE OF OHIO.

11) I, Michael Anthony Galluzzo, was called to testify in the matter on October 2, 2014.

12) After questioning by Lotus Justice, Executor for the defendant, MONICA GREER JUSTICE, and prior to exam by A. P. Graceffo, the jury was recessed and Asst. Prosecutor Graceffo began to interrogate me.

13) A. P. Graceffo asked me to provide my social security number.

14) I questioned A. P. Graceffo as to why he needed my social security number.

15) A. P. Graceffo stated he needed my number to run a background check to impeach me as a witness.

16) I again replied that I was not comfortable giving him my number.

17) A. P. Graceffo asked the judge to order me to comply.

18) Judge McIntosh stated to me that if I did not comply with the request, he would have to hold me in contempt and hold me until I gave him the number.

19) I requested that A. P. Graceffo produce the statute that required me to surrender my social security number.

20) A. P. Graceffo refused to produce the statute.

21) Again I declined and the offer of contempt was restated by Judge McIntosh.

22) I stated to Judge McIntosh and A. P. Graceffo the pursuant to the Privacy Act of 1974, I was not required to disclose my social security number.

23) Judge McIntosh and A. P. Graceffo persisted in their demands.

24) I proposed to A. P. Graceffo that he provide me a 'disclosure statement' as required by law and A. P. Graceffo stated he would not give me a statement.

25) Judge McIntosh again threatened me with contempt and incarceration.

26) I requested to consult a lawyer and Judge McIntosh declined my request.

27) After several minutes of analysis, I told Judge McIntosh that I didn't know if it was proper or not but that I was objecting on the record to providing my social security number.

28) I provided my social security number and the jury was recalled and the trial continued.

29) No information was used in A. P. Graceffo's questioning.

30) Later that day, I asked A. P. Graceffo for a copy of the information he had retrieved. He stated he couldn't give it to me but would check with the court.

31) On October 3, 2014, John Anthony Shutway was called to testify. I was informed that he was also asked to provide his social security number. He could not provide his number at that time and was taken into custody for a time until he was able to provide the court and A. P. Graceffo with his social security number.

32) I later learned that Ingrid Loesch, also called by the defense, was also threatened with contempt if she failed to provide her social security number.

33) On October 6, 2014, I again asked A. P. Graceffo for the documentation he obtained with my social security number and in an arrogant tone responded, "I'm not giving you anything, you can get it yourself!"

34) I, Michael Anthony Galluzzo, view the above actions as the legal system run amuck and a complete violation of the court's authority and my privacy..

35) I view the courts actions as an attempt to intimidate and tamper with witnesses.

36) I reserve the right to alter or amend this affidavit to correct any potential errors or misstatements that may come to my attention.

37) Further Affiant Sayeth Naught.

I attest that the facts stated herein in this affidavit are known to be true by me under oath under penalty of perjury by the laws of the Republic of the United States of America.

Michael Anthony Galluzzo
c/o P.O. Box 710
St. Paris, Ohio [43072]

AKNOWLEDGEMENT of SIGNATURE

State Ohio:
County of Champaign:

On this 1st day of November, 2014, before me, the undersigned ~~Notary Public~~ Notorial Officer, personally appeared, known to be or satisfactory proven to be the person whose name is subscribed to the above document, and acknowledged that he executed the same for the purposes expressed herein. I attest this under penalty of perjury under the laws of the Republic of the United States of America.

William-Harry: Ellwood
~~Notary Public~~
Notorial Officer

My Commission Expires