Withdrawn/Redacted Material
The George W. Bush Library

DOCUMENT NO.	FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
001	Court Filing	Motion for Leave to File Complaint	1	06/20/2001	P6/b6;
002	Court Filing	Motion for Leave to File Complaint	1	06/20/2001	P6/b6;
003	Court Filing	Complaint	1	06/20/2001	P6/b6;
004	Court Filing	Complaint [Page 6]	1	06/20/2001	P6/b6;
005	Court Filing	Brief in Support of Motion… [Page 1]	1	06/20/2001	P6/b6;
006	Court Filing	Brief in Support of Motion… [Page 18]	1	06/20/2001	P6/b6;
007	Court Filing	Proof of Service	1	06/20/2001	P6/b6;
008	Court Filing	Certificate of Service	1	06/20/2001	P6/b6;

COLLECTION TITLE:
Counsel's Office, White House

SERIES:
Kavanaugh, Brett - Subject Files

FOLDER TITLE:
Phillip Tinsley III v. US

FRC ID:
9630

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Records Not Subject to FOIA

Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

THE WHITE HOUSE
CORRESPONDENCE TRACKING WORKSHEET

DATE RECEIVED: 7/16/01

NAME OF CORRESPONDENT: Philip Tinsley

SUBJECT: Tinsley v. USA

ROUTE TO: OFFICE/AGENCY	(STAFF NAME)	ACTION: ACTION CODE	ACTION: DATE M/D/YR	DISPOSITION: TYPE RESP	DISPOSITION: C D	DISPOSITION: COMPLETED M/D/YR
	CUGONZ	A	7/16/01		C	
ACTION COMMENTS:						
	Brett	A				/ /
ACTION COMMENTS:						
			/ /			/ /
ACTION COMMENTS:						
			/ /			/ /
ACTION COMMENTS:						

COMMENTS: file in litigation files
Brett Kavanaugh
7/17/01

ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENTS:

MEDIA:

145007

No. ______________ Original

In The Supreme Court Of The United States

October Term, 2000

PHILIP TINSLEY III,

Plaintiff

v.

THE UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

Original Action

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE COMPLAINT

Philip Tinsley III

(b)(6)

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 2000

NO. ___________, ORIGINAL

PHILIP TINSLEY III,

Plaintiff

v.

THE UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE COMPLAINT

Philip Tinsley III, in pro se, respectfully requests leave of this Court to file his Complaint submitted herewith against The United States.

Philip Tinsley, III

Philip Tinsley III, Pro Se

June 20, 2001
Please address all communications to:

Philip Tinsley III

(b)(6)

No. ______________ Original

In The Supreme Court Of The United States

October Term, 2000

PHILIP TINSLEY III,

Plaintiff

v.

THE UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

Original Action

COMPLAINT

Philip Tinsley III

(b)(6)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 2000

NO. ____________, ORIGINAL

PHILIP TINSLEY III,

Plaintiff

v.

THE UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

COMPLAINT

Philip Tinsley III, in pro se, files this suit against the defendant, the United States(the President; the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee; the Chairman of the House Committee on Financial Services; and the Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit) and for his cause of action states:

A. Jurisdiction and the Need for the Court to Address this Controversy

1. The original and exclusive jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to Art. III, § 2,

Cl. 1a, b, d, & g, Cl. 2, & Cl. 3 of the United States(U.S.) Constitution.

2. The original and exclusive jurisdiction of this Court is invoked in order to resolve the disputes which arose with the filing of *Tinsley v. United States*(*Case No. 00-5059*, in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit) and *United States v. Tinsley*(*Case Nos. 01-1254*, in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit) in which the United States defaulted according to the *Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure* in both instances.

3. The defaulting by the United States and the previous defaulting by the Commonwealth/State of Virginia automatically necessitated awards and judgment in favor of the pro se party in *Case Nos. 00-5059 & 01-1254*. Denying these awards stole the personal property, took away liberty, and denied the pro se plaintiff the right to a trial by a jury. These are all violations of the U.S. Constitution and the United States Code(U.S.C.); therefore, this Court's jurisdiction is established under Article III, § 2, Cl. 1a & d, Cls. 2 & 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

4. Numerous attempts were made to resolve the issues without the filing of this lawsuit; however, the President; the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee; the Chairman of the House Committee on Financial Services; and the Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit were *indifferent to the truth*, illegally relived the pro se plaintiff of his civil rights, and were negligent in their duties established by the U.S. Constitution and the Laws of Congress; i.e. violations of Article II, §1, Cl. 7; Vth Amendment; 5 USC § 3331; 18 U.S.C. §s 241, 1341(Notes 46, 63, & 68), & 1505, 42 U.S.C. §s 1981(a), 1983, & 1985(2 & 3) which establish this Court's jurisdiction under Article III, § 2, Cl. 1a, b, d, & g, Cls. 2 & 3.

5. The crimes committed were also committed by citizens of Virginia and other states of the United States of America, but all were committed in the District of Columbia under the aforementioned cases while the perpetrators were in the service/employ of the federal

government which makes the United States a party in this complaint; therefore, this Court has jurisdiction under Article III, § 2, Cl. 1d & 1g.

6. All charges under 18 U.S.C. qualify as serious crimes/felony offenses, therefore, this Court has jurisdiction under Article III, § 2, Cl. 3.

7. The need for immediate resolution by this Court is exemplified by the negligent involvement of George W. Bush, the President of the United States; F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee; Michael G. Oxley, the Chairman of the House Committee on Financial Services; and Haldane Robert Mayer, the Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit; as well as the violations of the *Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives*, *Rules of the Committee on Financial Services*, and the *Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure*.

B. The History of the Complaint

1. On March 20, 2000, at 9:11 a.m., the pro se plaintiff filed an appeal in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit(*Case No. 00CV35*, in the U.S. Court of Federal Claims). It was assigned *Case No. 00-5059*, in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

2. On May 25, 2000, at 8:59 a.m., the pro se plaintiff filed a "MOTION FOR JUDGMENT" in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. No judge from the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit ruled on the filed motion.

3. On June 20, 2000, the pro se plaintiff filed an *original action* in the Supreme Court of the United States according to Rules 17, 29, 33.2, 34, & 38(a) of the *Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States*. Subsequently, the pro se plaintiff filed a "MOTION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT", on August 25, 2000, according to Rules 17.3, 21, 29, 33.1, & 34 of the *Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States*, but the case was never placed on the

docket and I was not contacted by this Court to proceed *ex parte*. This is a direct violation of the Vth Amendment with respect to "... due process of law ..." and of Rule 17.6 of the *Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States*.

4. On March 21, 2001, the pro se plaintiff, sent a letter by certified, return receipt mail to the Hon. Michael G. Oxley, Chairman of the House Committee on Financial Services explaining- one, the Hon. James Leach's(Banking and Finance Subcommittee) negligence; two, the federal lawsuit defaulting of Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, Quick & Reilly, Inc., the Department of Justice, FleetBoston Financial Corp., and Bank of America; and three, the fact that FleetBoston Financial Corp. and Summit Bank could not merge by Law ... I never received a response to this letter.

5. On March 24, 2001, I sent a letter to the Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, by certified, restricted, and return receipt mail. In the letter I explained that former President Clinton; former Vice President Albert Gore, Jr; former Vice Presidential candidate, Joseph Lieberman; former members of the Clinton Cabinet(Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and the Attorney General); the U.S. Senators of the 106th Congress; former Pentagon officials(Secretaries of the Navy and the former Chief of Naval Operations); and the Department of Justice(FBI, Attorney General for the State of New York- Elliot Spitzer, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, U.S. Court of Federal Claims, and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit) defaulted in a U.S. Supreme Court lawsuit that was illegally kept off of this Court's docket. Furthermore, I explained that his Committee had jurisdiction over the entire matter ... I never received a response to this letter.

6. Subsequently, I faxed(202-225-7682) six letters(March 23, May 4, May 8, May 11, May 17, and June 2, 2001) to the Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr. with enclosures explaining fraud and other criminal activity in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Eastern District of Virginia;

the State of Maryland(U.S. Postal System); the Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles(DMV); the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit; the City of Attorney's Office of Norfolk, Virginia; and by Donald M. Fishman of the law firm of Wolpoff & Abramson, L.L.P. ... I never received a response to these letters.

7. On April 16, 2001, I sent a letter by certified, return receipt mail to the President of the United States, George W. Bush. In the letter I explained the negligence of Congressmen Michael G. Oxley and F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr. in resolving the federal lawsuit defaults and requested that he prompt the respective U.S. House Committees to " ... schedule hearings ..." or contact me ... I never received a response to this letter.

8. Subsequently, I mailed one additional letter(May 7, 2001 by certified, restricted, return receipt) to the President requesting a meeting and faxed(202-456-2461) three other letters along with one memo to the President explaining his responsibility as Chief Executive Officer of the United States(Article II, §1, Cl. 1) relating to the criminal activity of the Norfolk, Virginia's City Attorney's Office, the Virginia Sheriff's Department, and the Virginia Judicial System ... I never received a response to any of this correspondence either.

9. On May 23, 2001, I mailed a letter to Chief Judge Haldane Robert Mayer of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit by certified, restricted, return receipt demanding that he properly rule on my "MOTION[S] FOR JUDGMENT" in *Case Nos. 00-5059 & 01-1254*, which were filed on May 25, 2000, at 8:59 a.m. and May 1, 2001, at 9:00 a.m., respectively in his Court ... I never received a response to this letter.

WHEREFORE, pro se plaintiff, Philip Tinsley III requests:

a. The default awards from his "MOTION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT", filed August 25, 2000, in this Court; and

b. ONE BILLION DOLLARS($1,000,000,000) for violations of Article II § 1 Cl. 7, the Vth Amendment, 5 U.S.C. § 3331, 18 U.S.C. §s 241, 1341(Notes 46, 63, & 68), & 1505, and 42 U.S.C. §s 1981(a), 1983, & 1985(2 & 3) by the President of the United States, the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the Chairman of the House Committee on Financial Services, and the Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit; and

c. Trial by jury denying Executive Privilege in lieu of the charges.

Philip Tinsley, III

Philip Tinsley III, Pro Se

June 20, 2001
Please Address all communications to:

Philip Tinsley III

(b)(6)

No. _______________ Original

In The Supreme Court Of The United States

October Term, 2000

PHILIP TINSLEY III,

Plaintiff

v.

THE UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

Original Action

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE COMPLAINT

Philip Tinsley III

(b)(6)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 2000

NO. ____________, ORIGINAL

PHILIP TINSLEY III,

Plaintiff

v.

THE UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE COMPLAINT

A. Questions Presented For Review Under Rule 14.1(a)

1. Does the President of the United States of America have the right to violate Article II, § 1, Cl. 7 of the U. S. Constitution in order to protect the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the Chairman of the House Committee on Financial Services, the former President of the United States, the former Vice President of the United States, or any United States banks and

corporations?

2. Can 18 U.S.C. §s 241, 1341, & 1505 apply to the President of the United States?

3. Can 42 U.S.C. §s 1983 & 1985(2 &3) apply to the President of the United States?

4. If members of the U.S. House of Representatives take and are subject to an oath of office according to 5 U.S.C. § 3331, then are they not negligent when ignoring the duties of their respective offices in the U.S. House of Representatives?

5. Are U.S. House of Representatives members subject to the laws that they make, i.e. the United States Code?

6. Do the U.S. House of Representatives members make the rules for the U.S. District Courts and the U.S. Courts of Appeals for the Federal Circuit?

7. Are federal judges subject to 5 U.S.C. § 3331?

8. Can a federal judge on a federal appellate court be guilty of "... denying due process of law ..." under the Vth Amendment while at the same time be guilty of *indifference to the truth* under 18 U.S.C. § 1341?

B. List of All Parties

1. George W. Bush, the President of the United States; and
2. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee; and
3. Michael G. Oxley, the Chairman of the House Committee on Financial Services; and
4. Haldane Robert Mayer, the Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

C. Citations

1. United States Postal money order receipt for $300.00, Serial No.

01745284061(Stamped by the Office of the Clerk of the Supreme Court, U.S., June 20, 2000);

2. "MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE COMPLAINT"(Stamped by the Office of the Clerk of the Supreme Court, U.S., June 20, 2000);

3. "COMPLAINT"(Stamped by the Office of the Clerk of the Supreme Court, U.S., June 20, 2000);

4. "BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE COMPLAINT"(Stamped by the Office of the Clerk of the Supreme Court, U.S., June 20, 2000);

5. "PROOF OF SERVICE"(Stamped by the Office of the Clerk of the Supreme Court, U.S., June 20, 2000);

6. United States PS Form 3811, July 1999(Article No. 7099 3220 0002 4563 9009-Delivered to White House June 22, 2000);

7. United States PS Form 3811, July 1999(Article No. 7099 3220 0002 4563 9016-Delivered to White House June 22, 2000);

8. United States PS Form 3811, July 1999(Article No. 7099 3220 0002 4563 9023-Delivered 6/23/00);

9. United States PS Form 3811, July 1999(Article No. 7099 3220 0002 4563 9030-Delivered 22 June 2000);

10. United States PS Form 3811, July 1999(Article No. 7099 3220 0002 4563 9047-Delivered June 22, 2000);

11. United States PS Form 3811, July 1999(Article No. 7099 3220 0002 4563 9054-Delivered 6/22/00);

12. United States PS Form 3811, July 1999(Article No. 7099 3220 0002 4563 9061-Delivered 6/22/00);

13. United States PS Form 3811, July 1999(Article No. 7099 3220 0002 4563 9078-

Delivered 6/22/00);

14. United States PS Form 3811, July 1999(Article No. 7099 3220 0002 4563 9085-Delivered June 22, 2000);

15. United States PS Form 3811, July 1999(Article No. 7099 3220 0002 4563 9092-Delivered June 22, 2000);

16. AERO BOOKBINDING Delivery Receipt(Job # 00-840, date 8-24-00);

17. "MOTION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT" in booklet format(Stamped by the Office of the Clerk of the Supreme Court, U.S., August 25, 2000);

18. "PROOF OF SERVICE" in booklet format(Stamped by the Office of the Clerk of the Supreme Court, U.S., August 25, 2000);

19. United States PS Form 3811, July 1999(Article No. 7099 3400 0005 8776 4883-Delivered to the White House August 29, 2000);

20. United States PS Form 3811, July 1999(Article No. 7099 3400 0005 8776 4852-Delivered to the White House August 29, 2000);

21. United States PS Form 3811, July 1999(Article No. 7099 3400 0005 8776 4821-Delivered 8/28/00);

22. United States PS Form 3811, July 1999(Article No. 7099 3400 0005 8776 4791-Delivered 30 August 2000);

23. United States PS Form 3811, July 1999(Article No. 7099 3400 0005 8776 4760-Delivered August 28, 2000);

24. United States PS Form 3811, July 1999(Article No. 7099 3400 0005 8776 4739-Delivered 8/28/2000);

25. United States PS Form 3811, July 1999(Article No. 7099 3400 0005 8776 4708-Delivered 8/28/00);

26. United States PS Form 3811, July 1999(Article No. 7099 3400 0005 8776 4678-Delivered 28 August 2000);

27. United States PS Form 3811, July 1999(Article No. 7099 3400 0005 8776 4647-Delivered August 28, 2000);

28. United States PS Form 3811, July 1999(Article No. 7099 3400 0005 8776 4616-Delivered August 30, 2000);

29. March 8, 2001 Letter to the Hon. James Leach(Regular, first class mail);

30. March 13, 2001 Letter to the Hon. James Leach(Regular, first class mail);

31. March 21, 2001 Letter to the Hon. Michael G. Oxley(United States PS Form 3811, July 1999; Article No. 7000 1670 0010 7413 1262-Delivered March 22, 2001);

32. April 7, 2001 Letter to the Hon. Michael G. Oxley from my mother, Hermione Bell Tinsley(Theft by MFS, Inc., United States PS Form 3811, July 1999, Article No. 7000 1670 0004 3500 1756-Delivered April 12, 2001);

33. March 23, 2001 Letter to the Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.(United States PS Form 3811, July 1999; Article No. 7000 1670 0004 3500 1787-Delivered March 26, 2001);

34. March 23, 2001 facsimile to the Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.(Complaint against the Virginia U.S. Attorney's Office);

35. May 4, 2001 facsimile to the Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.(Mail Fraud);

36. May 8, 2001 facsimile to the Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.(Fraud in the Virginia DMV);

37. May 11, 2001 facsimile to the Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.(Fraud in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit);

38. May 17, 2001 facsimile to the Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.(Fraud in the City Attorney's Office of Norfolk, Virginia);

39. June 2, 2001 facsimile to the Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.(Fraud from Wolpoff & Abramson, L.L.P.);

40. April 17, 2001 letter to the President of the United States(United States PS Form 3811, July 1999; Article No. 7000 1670 0004 3500 1725-Delivered April 18, 2001);

41. May 7, 2001 letter to the President of the United States(United States PS Form 3811, July 1999; Article No. 7099 3220 0006 5611 0395-Delivered May 10, 2001);

42. May 24, 2001 facsimile to the President of the United States(Fraud in the City Attorney's Office of Norfolk, Virginia);

43. June 6, 2001 facsimile to the President of the United States(Fraud in the City Attorney's Office of Norfolk, Virginia and breaking and entering by the Virginia Sheriff's Department);

44. June 11, 2001 facsimiles to the President of the United States(Memo and Vth Amendment violation by the Fairfax County General District Court-Fairfax, Virginia);

45. June 12, 2001 facsimile to the President of the United States(Continued fraud Mr. Donald M. Fishman of Wolpoff & Abramson, L.L.P.); and

46. May 23, 2001 letter to the Hon. Haldane Robert Mayer, Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit(United States PS Form 3811, July 1999; Article No. 7099 3220 0006 5611 0449-Delivered May 25, 2001).

D. Statement of the Basis for Jurisdiction

According to Article III, § 2, Cls. 1a, d, g, 2, & 3, the Supreme Court has "... judicial [p]ower ..." in "... all [c]ases ..." in which violations of the United States Constitution(see Article II, §1, Cl. 7 and the Vth Amendment) and violations of the United States Code(see 5 U.S.C., 18 U.S.C., 42 U.S.C.) have occurred. Furthermore, the Supreme Court has "... judicial [p]ower ..."

in "... [c]ontroversies to which the United States ...", i.e. President, Congressmen(from different States), and federal judges are "... [p]art[ies] ...". Finally, "... [t]he trial of all [c]rimes, ..." e.g. 18 U.S.C. violations shall be by jury(see 28 U.S.C. § 1872) in the Supreme Court.

E. Constitutional Provisions, Statutes, and Regulations Involved in the Case

1. Article II, § 1, Cls. 1 & 7;
2. Vth Amendment;
3. Rules X 1.(g) & (k) and XXIII 1. & 2. of the *Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives*;
4. Rules 1(a) & (b), 3(d)(1)(A), 5(a)(1)(A)(i) & (vii), 5(a)(1)(C)(i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), & (viii), 5(b)(1)(3), and 5(d)(1) of the *Rules of the Committee on Financial Services*;
5. 5 U.S.C. § 3331;
6. 18 U.S.C. §s 241, 1341(Notes 46, 63, & 68), & 1505;
7. Rule 55 of the *Federal Rules of Civil Procedure*; and
8. Rule 27(a)(3)(A) and 27(c) of the *Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.*

F. Statement of the Case

On March 21, 2001, the pro se plaintiff, mailed a letter to the Hon. Michael G. Oxley, the Chairman of the House Committee on Financial Services to complain about the Hon. James Leach's(Chairman of the House Banking and Fiance Subcommittee) indifference to the truth concerning the federal lawsuit defaults of Metropolitan Life Insurance Company(*Case No. 3:00CV56*), Quick & Reilly, Inc.(*Case No. 2:00CV291*), Department of Justice(*Case No. 00CV162*), Bank of America(*Case No. 2:00CV880*), and FleetBoston Financial Corp.(*Case No. 00-2147-A*). All of the aforementioned defendants defaulted in federal court(U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia and U.S. Court of Federal Claims), the "MOTION[S] FOR JUDGMENT" were filed, but no awards were rendered and no payments were made to the plaintiff(s). Furthermore, the letter also warned the Hon. Michael G.Oxley about an illegal merger that was about to take place between FleetBoston Financial Corp. and Summit Bank. Copies of the letter were sent to President Bush, Chief Justice Rehnquist, and the Federal Reserve Board by regular first class mail, but only the Federal Reserve Board responded by mail.

On March 23, 2001, the pro se plaintiff mailed a letter to the Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, complaining about the illegal non-docketing of his U.S. Supreme Court lawsuit against the now former President William Jefferson Clinton; the former Vice President Albert Gore, Jr.; former Vice Presidential candidate Joseph Lieberman; the U.S. Senators of the 106th Congress; the former Secretaries of State, Defense, and the Navy; the former Attorney General; the former Chief of Naval Operations; the F.B.I.; the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia; the U.S.Court of Federal Claims; and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. Furthermore, I reminded the Congressman that the U.S. House of Representatives had impeached former President Clinton in *House Resolution 611* on December 19, 1998. Along with my letter this pro se plaintiff enclosed filed(June 20, 2000 and August 25, 2000) copies of "MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE COMPLAINT", "COMPLAINT", "BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE COMPLAINT", "PROOF[S] OF SERVICE", and the "MOTION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT" and this pro se plaintiff mailed a copy of the letter to President Bush by regular, first class mail. I also requested a date to appear before the U.S. House of Representatives to give sworn testimony to the serious charges, but never received any acknowledgement from the Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.

Earlier in the same month, on March 19, 2001, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal

Circuit docketed *Case No. 01-1254*, in the United States'(Department of Justice) attempt to prosecute this pro se plaintiff illegally. This incident brought forth four letters(March 23, May 4, May 8, & May 11, 2001) which were faxed to the Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner Jr. with enclosures/evidence, and copies were mailed to Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist(U.S. Supreme Court) by regular, first class mail. The four letters cited incidents of criminal fraud by the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Eastern District of Virginia and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit and requested the arrest of the perpetrators. I never received any correspondence from Congressman Sensenbrenner.

The final two faxed letters(May 17 and June 2, 2001) to the Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr. concerned the continued criminal fraud and harassment by a Mr. Charles S. Prentace of the Norfolk, Virginia City Attorney's Office to which this pro se plaintiff was a party through *Case Nos. 2:00CV327 & 2:00CV360*, filed in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia(Norfolk Division) and the continued criminal fraud and harassment by a Mr. Donald M. Fishman of Wolpoff & Abramson, L.L.P.(Rockville, Maryland), respectively. This pro se plaintiff on the bases of the faxed enclosures/evidence requested the arrest of Mr. Charles S. Prentace and the arrest and disbarment of Mr. Donald M. Fishman. I never received a response from Congressman Sensenbrenner.

Since this pro se plaintiff received no correspondence from Congressmen Oxley or Sensenbrenner or from their respective Committees, it was now time to contact the President of the United States directly. On April 16, 2001, this pro se plaintiff mailed a letter to President George W. Bush complaining about the dereliction of duty of the aforementioned U.S. Representatives and the inability of the U.S. Senate to handle these most serious matters. Furthermore, this pro se plaintiff once again requested an answer and a hearing date in the U.S. House of Representatives ... I received no response to this certified, return receipt letter.

On May 7, 2001, this pro se plaintiff sent a second letter to President Bush via certified, restricted, return receipt mail reminding him of his power and responsibility under the U.S. Constitution(Article II, §1, Cl. 1) and that John D. Ashcroft was unable to act as the Attorney General for the United States(see *Case No. 99-952-A* and "MOTION FOR JUDGMENT BY ENTRY OF DEFAULT", U.S. Supreme Court). Finally, this pro se plaintiff requested a response and stated that he would be "... available for a meeting or to give testimony and present evidence[ ]"... I never received a response to this letter either.

Since the fraud from the Norfolk, Virginia City Attorney's Office continued with a new criminal addition(breaking and entering) from the Virginia Sheriff's Department, this pro se plaintiff was forced to fax two letters(May 24 and June 6, 2001) to President Bush at the White House. I once again explained that as Chief Executive Officer of the United States(Article II, §1, Cl. 1) that he had to take responsibility, since one- Congressman Sensenbrenner did not; two, there was no legitimate Attorney General for the United States; and three, Mark L. Earley, the Virginia Attorney General, was guilty under 18 U.S.C. charges in *Case No. 3:00CV670*(U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia).

On June 11 & 12, 2001, this pro se plaintiff was forced to fax two additional letters with evidence to President Bush about the violation of this pro se plaintiff's U.S. Constitutional rights to subpoena the Hon. Michael G. Oxley(Chairman of the House Committee on Financial Services), Kenneth D. Lewis(CEO of Bank of America), and Hugh L. McColl, Jr.(former CEO of Bank of America) in *Case No. C2001-005370* by the Fairfax County General District Court, and about additional criminal acts by Mr. Donald M. Fishman. Needless to say, there has been no response from President Bush to me.

Finally, on May 24, 2001, this pro se plaintiff mailed a certified, restricted, return receipt letter to the Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, Haldane Robert

Mayer complaining of denial of due process of law in *Case Nos. 00-5059 & 01-1254*. The "MOTION[S] FOR JUDGMENT" were filed on May 25, 2000, at 8:59 a.m. and on May 1, 2001, at 9:00 a.m. in the Clerk's Office of Chief Judge Mayer's Court; however, no dates for oral arguments were ever scheduled and no award was ever made to this pro se plaintiff after the time period for the "UNITED STATES" to file had expired. I never received a response to this letter.

G. Summary of the Argument

The President of the United States before entering his office took an oath to "... preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States." Likewise, elected members of the U.S. House of Representatives and federal judges have taken an oath to " ... support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies ... ". This means that all of the aforementioned individuals in their elected/appointed offices must execute the duties of their respective offices without hesitation.

Jurisdiction over banks and banking, debt collection and debtors rights, insurance, and securities and exchanges has been established by the *Rules of the House of Representatives* and the *Rules of the Committee on Financial Services*. Furthermore, jurisdiction over civil and criminal judicial proceedings, civil liberties, federal courts and judges, claims against the United States, and Presidential succession has been established by the *Rules of the House of Representatives*. This means that the House Committees on Financial Services and the Judiciary have full responsibility and complete jurisdiction over all violations of the U.S. Constitution including federal lawsuit defaults. U.S. House of Representative members, Michael G. Oxley(Chairman of the House Committee on Financial Services) and F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.(Chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary) were notified by the U.S. Postal System and by facsimile transmission from this pro se plaintiff's home of U.S. Constitutional violations, i.e. the illegal non-docketing of the U.S. Supreme Court filings of June 20, 2000 and August 25, 2000; the defaulting of the United States in *Case Nos. 00-5059*, *00CV283*, *00CV162*; the defaulting of the Commonwealth/State of Virginia in *Case No. 3:00CV670*; and the defaulting of Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, Quick & Reilly, Inc., FleetBoston Financial Corp., and Bank of America in *Case Nos. 3:00CV56*, *2:00CV291*, *00-2147-A*, *& 2:00CV88*0, respectively. "MOTION[S] FOR JUDGMENT" were filed in all of the aforementioned cases ... to date, neither Congressman Sensenbrenner nor Congressman Oxley have responded, nor have any default awards been rendered to this pro se plaintiff or to his immediate family members.

In an illegal and most incompetent attempt, the United States tried to retaliate by suing this pro se plaintiff in U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia(Alexandria Division). This pro se plaintiff, who was a defendant in that case, appealed the case to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit thereby becoming an appellant. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit docketed the appeal under *Case No. 01-1254*. Needless to say, the United States defaulted in this case as well and this pro se plaintiff/appellant filed a "MOTION FOR JUDGMENT" in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit's Clerk's Office. After more than twenty(20) days, this pro se plaintiff/appellant contacted Chief Judge Haldane Robert Mayer of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit through the U.S. Postal System citing "... denial of due process of law ..." and requesting that awards be made in both cases-*Case Nos. 00-5059 & 01-1254*. To date, Chief Judge Haldane Robert Mayer has not responded to the letter or rendered a judgment in favor of this pro se plaintiff/appellant.

H. Argument

1. George W. Bush, the current President of the United States, took an oath of office "... to ... preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States[ ]"(see Article II, § 1, Cl.

7). He is being charged with violating this oath when he became guilty of mail fraud under 18 U.S.C. § 1341, Notes 46, 63, & 68. President Bush has not responded to any of this pro se plaintiff's mailed or faxed letters. All of the mailed and faxed letters contains items which require that he execute the duties of his office(see Article II, § 1, Cl. 1). By receiving the letters and enclosures, President Bush was given the knowledge that this pro se plaintiff's liberty, money/property had been illegally appropriated. Furthermore, by ignoring these facts and being guilty of 18 U.S.C. § 1341, Notes 46, 63, & 68, the President is also guilty of violating this pro se plaintiff's civil rights which brings forth the charges of violating 42 U.S.C. §s 1983 & 1985(2 & 3).

2. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee also took an oath of office(see 5 U.S.C. § 3331) to " ... support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies ... " and to "... faithfully discharge the duties of the office [i]n which [he] ... enter[ed]." Furthermore, he is subjected to Rule X(k)(1), (2), (5), (7), (10) & (14) and Rule XXIII(1) & (2) of the *Rules of the House of Representatives*. Congressman Sensenbrenner received letters and U.S. Supreme Court filings via the United States Postal System, including a reminder that the U.S. House of Representatives impeached former President William Jefferson Clinton in *House Resolution 611*, along with facsimiles citing abuses in the federal judiciary; yet, he chose to be "... indifferent to the truth ..." and did not respond to any of the mailings or facsimiles. This makes him guilty of 18 U.S.C. § 1341, Notes 46, 63, & 68. Congressman Sensenbrenner was given the knowledge that this pro se plaintiff's liberty, money, and property had been misappropriated without due process of law and did not exercise the authority or power of his office to correct these matters, bringing forth the charges of violating 42 U.S.C. §s 1983 & 1985(2 & 3).

3. Michael G. Oxley, the Chairman of the House Committee on Financial Services took

the same oath of office as Congressman Sensenbrenner, namely to " ... support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies ... " and to "... faithfully discharge the duties of the office [i]n which [he] ... enter[ed]." Furthermore, he is subjected to Rule 1(a) & (b) of the *Rules of the Committee On Financial Services* as well as Rule X(g)(1), (4), (7) & (9) and Rule XXIII(1) & (2) of the *Rules of the House of Representatives.* Congressman Oxley received letters via the United States Postal System including a reminder that the Fleet-Summit merger had to be canceled due to FleetBoston Financial Corp's established guilt of racketeering(*Case No. 00-2147-A, Tinsley* v. *FleetBoston Financial Corp.*, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia), along with copies of letters complaining about the Chairman of the Banking and Finance Subcommittee, James Leach, citing federal violations in consumer accounts; yet, he also chose to be "... indifferent to the truth ..." and did not respond to any of the mailings or facsimiles. This makes him guilty of 18 U.S.C. § 1341, Notes 46, 63, & 68. Congressman Oxley was given the knowledge that this pro se plaintiff's liberty, money, and property had been stolen as well as the pro se plaintiff's mother's and grandmother's money(see *Case No. 2:00CV880, Bell, Tinsley, & Tinsley* v. *Bank of America*, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia) without due process of law and Oxley did not exercise the authority or power of his office to correct these matters which brings forth charges of violating 42 U.S.C. §s 1983 & 1985(2 & 3).

4. Haldane Robert Mayer, Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit also took an oath of office(see 5 U.S.C. § 3331) for the federal judiciary to " ... support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies ... " and to "... faithfully discharge the duties of the office [i]n which [he] ... enter[ed]." Judge Mayer was given full knowledge of the denial of due process of law(see Vth Amendment) via a letter delivered by the United States Postal System. Both cases(*Tinsley* v. *United States, Case No. 00-5059* & *United States* v. *Tinsley, Case No. 01-1254*) were in his Court, yet Chief Judge Mayer elected to be

indifferent to the truth and ignore the rules of his Court[see Rule 27(a)(3)(A) & 27(c) of the *Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure*] and the U.S. Constitution(see Vth Amendment). Therefore, Chief Judge Haldane Robert Mayer is guilty of violating 18 U.S.C. § 1341, Notes 46, 63, & 68 and is being charged with violating 42 U.S.C. §s 1983 & 1985(2 & 3) as well.

5. President George W. Bush, the Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., the Hon. Michael G. Oxley, and the Hon. Haldane Robert Mayer, are all being charged with violating their oaths of office with these actions. Since they all have the same information and have access to all of the aforementioned federal lawsuits which are in default, with the "MOTION[S] FOR JUDGMENT" having been filed, and since all individuals have omitted their responsibilities, this pro se plaintiff also charges them with violating 18 U.S.C. §s 241 & 1505.

6. Table of Authorities Relied Upon:

(a) United States Code [Annotated](U.S.C[A.])

(b) *Federal Rules of Civil Procedure*(Amended December 1, 2000)

(c) *Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure*(Amended December 1, 2000)

(d) *Rules of the House of Representatives*(107th Congress)

(e) *Rules of the Committee On Financial Services*(107th Congress)

(f) *The Meaning of the Constitution*, 3rd Ed. by Holder & Holder

(g) *House Resolution 611*(December 19, 1998)

I. Conclusion

Apparently, all parties charged in this civil action have no conception of the U.S. Constitution and the oaths they took upon entering their respective offices to support it. President Bush has failed to comprehend the meaning of defaulting in a federal lawsuit. *Case No. 00-5059* and the U.S. Supreme Court filings of June 20 and August 25, 2000, remain unanswered.

This means that former President Clinton, former Vice President Albert Gore, Jr., the U.S. Senators of the 106th Congress, Spencer Abraham, John D. Ashcroft, *et ali* are guilty of felony offenses(18 U.S.C.). John D. Ashcroft(see also *Case No. 99-952-A*, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia) cannot be the Attorney General of the United States; Spencer Abraham cannot be the Energy Secretary; and there is no legitimate U.S. Senate Armed Services or Judiciary Committee(see also *Case Nos. 99-951-A & 99-952-A*, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia). Therefore, according to the U.S. Constitution(Article II, § 1, Cl. 1), President Bush is in charge of all of these judicial matters in conjunction with the U.S. House of Representatives' Committee on the Judiciary.

House Judiciary Committee Chairman, F. James Sensenbrenner must have known that former President Clinton escaped justice when the U.S. Senate did not impeach President Clinton as the U.S. House of Representatives did on December 19, 1998, in *House Resolution 611*; one of the charges was "... Obstruction of Justice. (221 yeas; 212 nays)". The facsimiles and mailings that were sent to Congressman Sensenbrenner cited numerous incidents of obstruction of justice, abuses of power, indifference to the truth, and denial of due process of law(failure to award and the illegal denial of filing rights). These acts were committed by federal judges-Chief Judge Loren A. Smith(U.S. Court of Federal Claims), Chief Judge Claude M. Hilton(U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia), Senior Judges Albert V. Bryan, Jr. and Richard L. Williams(U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia), Judges Robert E. Payne and Jerome B. Friedman(U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia), Norfolk Circuit Court Judge Everett A. Martin, Jr.(Norfolk, Virginia); U.S. Magistrate Judge Thomas Rawles Jones, Jr.; the U.S. Courts of Claims and Appeals; Attorney Generals Elliott Spitzer(New York) and Mark L. Earley(Virginia); Department of Justice(FBI); and the Fairfax County Police Department(see *Case No. 01-279-A*, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia). As Chairman of the

House Committee on the Judiciary, F. James Sensenbrenner has jurisdiction over the prosecution of the aforementioned individuals and a sworn responsibility(5 U.S.C. § 3331) to uphold the U.S. Constitution ... to date, he has not done this.

The situation is likewise for Michael G. Oxley, the Chairman of the House Committee on Financial Services. He also received notification by the United States Postal System that Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, Quick & Reilly, Inc., FleetBoston Financial Corp., and Bank of America have defaulted in federal lawsuits as defendants against this pro se plaintiff/my immediate family members(mother-Hermione Bell Tinsley and grandmother-Harryette Hewin Bell) in their respective lawsuits. As a member of the U.S. House of Representatives and as Chairman of the House Committee on Financial Services, Oxley has taken an oath(5 U.S.C. § 3331) to uphold the U.S. Constitution and is fully aware of Rules 5(a)(1)(A)(i) & (vii) and 5(a)(1)(C)(i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), & (viii) of the *Rules of the Committee On Financial Services*. Therefore, his jurisdiction encompasses all of the aforementioned financial institutions and federal lawsuit defaults.

Chief Judge Haldane Robert Mayer of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit presents the worst enigma of all. A West Point graduate and retired officer with a distinguished military record(see *1999 Winter Judicial Staff Directory*, 13th Ed.) must be fully cognizant of laws and rules and used to taking oaths. The reason, at this time, the Chief Judge chooses to ignore his responsibility under the U.S. Constitution, under oath(5 U.S.C. 3331), and under the *Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure* is a subject worth presenting on the floor of the U.S. Supreme Court. Chief Judge Mayer received a letter via the United States Postal System which included the pertinent case numbers and the current status of each case; nevertheless, he did not execute the function of his office.

The prima facie evidence in this case is overwhelming; it would demonstrate untold wisdom for President George W. Bush, Congressmen Sensenbrenner and Oxley, and Chief Judge Haldane Robert Mayer to settle this case outside of this Court.

Pro se plaintiff, Philip Tinsley III, requests relief in the form of:

1. The default awards from his "MOTION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT", filed August 25, 2000, in this Court; and
2. ONE BILLION DOLLARS($1,000,000,000); and
3. Trial by jury denying Executive Privilege in lieu of the charges.

Philip Tinsley, III

Philip Tinsley III, Pro Se

June 20, 2001
Please address all communications to:

Philip Tinsley III

(b)(6)

No. ______________ Original

In The Supreme Court Of The United States

October Term, 2000

PHILIP TINSLEY III,

Plaintiff

v.

THE UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

Original Action

RECEIVED
HAND DELIVERED
JUN 2 0 2001
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

PROOF OF SERVICE

Philip Tinsley III

(b)(6)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, PHILIP TINSLEY III, the pro se plaintiff in this proceeding, do hereby certify that on the 20th day of June 2001, I served copies of the "MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE COMPLAINT", together with copies of the "COMPLAINT", "BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE COMPLAINT", and this "CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE" annexed thereto, by mailing one copy in accordance with Rule 29.3 & 29.4 of the *Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States* thereof in duly addressed envelopes, with first class, certified, return receipt postage(Article Nos. 7099 3220 0006 5611 0517, 7099 3220 0006 5611 0524, 7099 3220 0006 5611 0531, 7099 3220 0006 5611 0548, and 7099 3220 0006 5611 0616) to each of the President of the United States, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W., Washington, DC 20500; the Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, 2138 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515; the Hon. Michael G. Oxley, Chairman of the House Committee on Financial Services, 2129 Rayburn H.O.B., Washington, DC 20515; the Hon. Haldane Robert Mayer, Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, 717 Madison Place, NW, Washington, DC 20439-0002; and the Solicitor General of the United States, Room 5614, Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20530-0001, respectively.

All parties required to be served have been served.

Philip Tinsley, III

Philip Tinsley III, Pro Se

(b)(6)

City/~~County~~ of Falls Church

Commonwealth/State of Virginia

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 20 day of June, 2001. Witness my hand and official seal.

Notary Public

My Comm. Exps. 12/31, 2004