

(PHASE I)

By: Dr. Blair Reich, blackcollarcartel.com

DEDICATION TO RETIRED SENIOR JUDGE WILLIAM P MAHON

This Affidavit is dedicated to Retired Senior Judge William P Mahon, with your "25 years on the bench," and all your fellow judicial playmates who, despite all that grown-up experience, still find yourselves scratching your heads over what you so cutely called "**Convoluting Federal Supremacy**." Oh, sweetie, bless your heart—it's like watching a toddler try to learn quantum entanglement. I know in your heart of hearts you just want to do things your way, but the rather stern Constitution just won't cooperate. Neither will I.

As a former teacher and professor who patiently guided many mentally handicapped and special ed students through tricky concepts (you know, the kind where we use simple words and lots of repetition), I'm here to hold your tender retired senior judicial hands and deconvolute this super duper hard topic for you. We're going to go through the "DOs and DONT's" of Federal Supremacy as today's main class lesson. And yes, that includes what happens when you don't follow the rules. So, just sit tight for a few hundred pages extensively detailing how you and your buddies are effectuating an interstate human trafficking and racketeering operation by way of daily acts of treason by abusing family law and the Title IV-D system. NO SIR. We don't do that here. NO THANK YOU! Seems you and your buddies need a lesson on the law and a long expensive time out.

See, friends, the US Constitution is like the big boss—it's the Supreme Law of the Land, and your teeny tiny state statutes or private contracts are just the little helpers that have to follow along. You don't get to pick and choose, okay? No tantrums about "but my courtroom and my rules say otherwise!" Got it, got it? Those God-given rights, constitutional protections, privileges, and immunities aren't up for your playground vote—they've already been decided by the grown-ups at the Supreme Court. Our forefathers didn't die in bloodsoaked battles just so you could fleece a divorcing dad whose life is already getting torn asunder. And even if you feel a bit less special than the big judges at the supreme court (aww, poor thing), you still have to play by their rules. Otherwise, you and your judge buddies and all the elected and appointed officials who participate, conspire, turn a blind eye, or sign State Plans (like every state Governor) help the Black Collar Cartel and open yourselves up to some truly **ungodly** amounts of liability—like, the kind that follows in this affidavit that alchemizes nap times into nightmares.

Billy, it's my sincere, nurturing hope that this Affidavit acts like a gentle storytime, helping you and your peers finally grasp **Federal Supremacy**... and the ouchy consequences of pretending it doesn't apply to you. Big hugs—now let's clean up this **convoluted** mess before Treason puts you in a permanent timeout!

Bill, in all seriousness, I dedicate this work to your learning and growth and also to state judges, elected and/or appointed officials and their learning too. I have faith in you all. You'll see the Radiant Light. And you're going to need it to help you in the forthcoming darkness. Chin up.

BY:

reich: blair

two hundred and twenty seven cherry street
columbia, lancaster county, pennsylvania [republic]
979-574-1577

blairjesseellynreich@gmail.com

Free white man, Pennsylvanian, agent, Sui Juris

FOR:

BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH

227 CHERRY ST

COLUMBIA, PA 17512

ENS LEGIS, US PERSON, US CITIZEN, PRO SE

To:

David MacMain

433 W. Market Street, Suite 200

West Chester, PA 19382

Sonya Kivisto

PO Box 61260

Harrisburg, PA 17106-1260

Notice to agent is notice to principal and notice to principal is notice to agent.

CC DEFENDANTS AND RESPONDENTS (251):

PRIVATE (2)

Alene Wilmoth Reich, 128 E Market Street, Marietta, PA 17547, service to wendy chan
Wendy Chan, CHAN AND ASS. 39 N Lime Street, Lancaster PA 17603.

LANCASTER COUNTY, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS LANCASTER COUNTY PENNSYLVANIA & DRS (20+ 12)

JUDGES- The Dishonorable - William P Mahon; David L. Ashworth; Merrill Spahn Jr; Craig
Steadman; Christopher Hackman; Dennis Reinaker; Donald Totaro; Howard Kinsely; Jefferey
Wright; Jeffery Reich; Margaret Miller; Leonard Brown III; Thomas B. Sponaugle; Jeffrey
Conrad; JoAnne Murphy; Shawn McLaughlin; Todd Brown; Christina Parsons; Edward D.
Reibman

NON-JUDGES- Andrew Spade; Jaquelyn Pfursich; Heather Adams; Chrisopher Leppler; Daniel
Scarberry; Joshua Parson; Ray D'Agostino; Craig Lehman; Nicky Woods, Alice Yoder, Penn
Glazier; Richard Gromen. 50 N. Duke Street, Lancaster PA, 17602; Fax (717) 295-3599

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS LANCASTER COUNTY PENNSYLVANIA DOMESTIC RELATIONS (16)

Gary Kline, 150 N Queen St., Lancaster, PA 17603 (717) 293-7208 - Fax
Linda Grill, Deputy Director
4 John Doe Accountants and conference officers at Lancaster CCP
10 Jane Doe Accountants at PA DHS

LANCASTER COUNTY MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT JUDGES (19)

Clark A. Beringer, 2 Cardinal Dr. Stevens, PA 17578, Fx: 717-336-3394
John E. Bender, Esq 150 N. Queen St., Suite 120, Lancaster, PA 17603 Fx: 717-209-3031
William E. Benner Jr. 324 Beaver Valley Pk, Willow Street, PA 17584 Fx: 717-464-2824
Miles K. Bixler, 341 Chestnut Street, Columbia, PA 17512 Fx: 717-684-9774
Brian E. Chudzik, 2168 Embassy Drive, Suite 150, Lancaster, PA 17603. Fx: 717-735-2270
B. Denise Commins, 15 Geist Road, Lancaster, PA 17601 Fx: 717-656-4425
Jonathan Heisse, 745B E. Main St., New Holland, PA 17557 Fx: 717-354-8881
Michael D. Hess 424 S. Angle St., Mount Joy, PA 17552 Fx: 717-653-0401
Joshua R. Keller, 841 Stehman Road, Millersville, PA 17551 Fx: 717-872-1190
Torrey J. Landis, 609 E. Main St., Ephrata, PA 17522 Fx: 717-733-4330
Andrew LeFever, 796-A New Holland Ave.; Lancaster, PA 17602 Fx: 717-390-2344
William R. Mankin, II, 25 E. State St., Quarryville, PA 17566 Fx: 717-786-2072
Randall L. Miller, 920 South Spruce Street, Elizabethtown, PA 17022 Fx 717-367-8019
Courtney M. Monson, 2205 Oregon Pike, Lancaster, PA 17601 Fx: 717-569-8721
Jodie Richardson, 123 Locust St., Lancaster, PA 17602 Fx: 717-299-8375
Raymond S. Sheller 14 Center St. PO Box 618, intercourse, PA 17534 Fx: 717-768-3250
Mary Mongiovi Sponaugle, 1351 Elm Ave., Lancaster, PA 17603 Fx: 717-390-2346
Joseph C. Stauffer, 690 Furnace Hills Pike, Lititz, PA 17543 Fx: 717-626-5528
Adam J. Witkonis, 641 Union Street, Lancaster, PA 17603 Fx: 717-390-2345

FEDERAL (1)

Wayne A. Jacobs, Special Agent in Charge of the FBI Field Office in Philadelphia, William J Green Jr. Building, 600 Arch Street, 8th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19106, 215-418-4000

STATE (4)

Josh Shapiro, Gov. of Pennsylvania, 508 Main Capitol Building, Harrisburg, PA 17120. Fax 717-772-8284
Al Schmidt, PA Secretary of State, 401 North Street, rm 302, Harrisburg PA 17120 Fax 717 787-1734
David Sunday, PA AG, 16th Floor, Strawberry Square, Harrisburg PA 17120 Fx 717 783 1107
Col. Christopher Paris, COMMISSIONER OF THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE, 1800 Elmerton Ave, Harrisburg, PA 17110. % Office of Chief Counsel Fax: 717-772-2883

PENNSYLVANIA SUPREME COURT SYSTEM (7)

Superior Court of Pennsylvania, 601 Commonwealth Avenue, PO Box 61260, Suite 1500, Harrisburg, PA 17106 Mary Jane Bowes, President Judge Anne E. Lazarus, President Judge Emeritus Correale F. Stevens.

Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, 601 Commonwealth Avenue, PO Box 61260, Suite 1500, Harrisburg, PA 17106 Justices include Debra Todd, Christine Donohue, Kevin M. Dougherty, David N. Wecht, Sallie Updyke Mundy, P. Kevin Brobson, Daniel D. McCaffery Via Fax % Office of Legal Counsel 717-772-1605 and % Executive Administrator's Office FAX 717/231-9501

Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, DISTRICT I (43) 1601 market st. suite 3320, Philadelphia, PA 19103 Members include- Michael F. Barrett; Scott Alan Bennett; Harris Book; Joseph N. Bongiovanni, IV; William J. Brennan, Butler Buchanan; Robert James Cahall; Maureen Cassidy; Thomas Henry Chiacchio; Francis N Cipro; Hope Ann Comisky; Patrick Joseph Cosgrove; Timothy James Ford; Christopher Michael Fox, Anthony Louis Gallia; Mark Bradly Goodhear; Jason Peter Gosselin; Kenneth Grunfeld; Catherine Nora Harrington; Jordan Lyles Howell; Jonathan W. Hugg; Damia S. Jackson; Debra Andrea Jensen; Jillian Elizabeth Johnston; Paul J. Kennedy; Alan Klein; Brend William Landau; Mark Gerar Lionetti; Tyesha Colleen Miley; Patrice Smith O'Brien; Kevin E. Raphael; Henry Falkner Reichner; Daniel Erik Thynhart; Michael T. Scott; Tomas N. Sweeney; Robert Thaddeus Szostak; Dawn M. Tancredi; Michele E. Turner; Heidi Villari; Melissa Murphy Weber; Dean Eric Weisgold; Keld Rolf Wenge; Brian J. Zeiger; FAX 215/560-6296

Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, DISTRICT II (35) 820 Adams Ave. Suite 170, Trooper, PA 19403 Members Include Robert A. Auclair; Eric Jay Bronstein; Timothy W. Callahan II; Jimmy C. Chong; Evelyn Rodriguez Devine; Elizabeth C. Early; Zanetta Maree Ford; Allan D. Goulding Jr; Enis Aloysius Gray; Lance Deshawn Jason Greene; John Sung jin Han; James Clifford Higgins Jr.; Philip Marsh Hof; Lauren Ashley Hughes; Marina Kats; Jeffrey Allen Krawitz; Aimee L. Kumer; Sophia Lee; Teresa A. Mallon; Tina Mazaheri; James Joseph McCarrie II; Danielle Peyakovich McNichol; Renee Andrea nolan; George Gerasimos Rassias; Adam Samuel Rosenthal; Christine Marie Sadler; Raymond J. Santarelli; Kristin Elizabeth Shicora; Joshua Slomich; Eric B. Smith; Donald F. Spry II; Neil Andrew Stein; Francis J. Sullivan; Joseph Patrick Walsh; Christine Wechsler; FAX 610/650-8213

Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, DISTRICT III (25) 601 Commonwealth Ave., Suite 5800 PO Box 62675 Harrisburg PA 17106 Members include Seth Thomas Black; Matthew Gerard Boyd; Jenni Henley Chavis; Vincent Cimini; Maria P. Cagnetti; Timothy Michael Doherty; Paul D. Edger; Victoria Porcel Edwards; Andrew J. Giorgione; Jason C. Giurintano; Peter M. Good; Jonathan David Koltash; Donald Marritz; Katharine Stone Marteny; Carrie Jardim McConnell; Veronica Lee Morrison; Daniel Lawrence Penetar Jr.; Mark Thomas Perry; A. Lisa Pierotti; Timothy Paul Polishan; Beverly Heather Rampaul; Anthony G. Ross III; Matthew Alan Sembach; David Tepper; Dana Marie Wucinski; FAX 717/772-7463

Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, DISTRICT IV (40) 437 Grant St. Suite 1300, Pittsburgh, PA 15219 members include Jennifer Rebekah Andrade; Charles Joseph Avalli; Jamie Bishop; Jessica Bole; Matthew Allen Bole; William P. Bresnahan; Henry M. Casale; Elizabeth Farina Collura; Nicole Anne Daller; Kathleen Patricia Dapper; Michael Tomas Della Vecchia; Phillip Ray Earnest; Jennifer Krause Fisher; Joseph Froetschel; Elizabeth L Hughes; Autumn Leah Jonson; Katie Adams Killion; Amy Michelle Kirkham; Jason Mark Lichtenstein; Daniel Patrick Lynch; Thomas A. McDonnell; Jason Alan Medure; Colin Adair Morgan; Robert Sean O'Connell; Russell John Over Jr.; Jason Louis Ott; Joan E Owhe; Shelly Renee Pagac; Ashley Ardoin Piovesan; Bruce Edward Rende; Richard William Roda; Joseph Christopher Romano; Justin Thomas Romano; Jason Marc Schiffman; Charlene Sten Seibert; Michael D. Simon; Jason Charles Tetlow; Gregory Reid Unatin; Ryan D. Very; Gina Marie Zumpella; FAX 412/565-7620

Leadership Board of the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania (23), 601 commonwealth Ave., Suite 5600 PO Box 62675 Harrisburg PA 17106 Members include John C. Rafferty Jr.; Gretchen A. Mundorff; Gaetan J. Alfano; Joshua M. Bloom, Celeste L. Dee; Laura E. Ellsworth; Christopher M. Miller; Robert J. Mongeluzzi; Bryan S. Neft; Catherine R. O'Donnell; Robert L. Repard; David S. Senoff; Shohin H. Vance; Joshua F. Wilson; Thomas J. Farrell; Raymond S. Wierciszewski; Jesse G Hereda; Dana C. Belella; Marcee D. Sloan; Suzanne E. Price; Laura K. Mohnery; Kimberly M. Henderson; FAX 717-783-4963

Central Intake Counsel (6), Frick Building, Ste. 1300, 437 Grant Srteet, Pittsburgh, PA 15219 Jana M. Palko; Robin B Godfry; Elizabeth J. Rubin; Dana M. Pirone; Anna M. Ciardi; Rebeca K. Leventopolous; Samuel F. Napoli

Judicial Conduct Board (10), PO Box 62525, Harrisburg PA 17120 members include James P McCloskey, Andrew E. Masich, Susan P. Gantman, Marie Conley, Alice Beck Dubow, William J. Kissner, Schott B. Cooper, Risa Vetri Ferman, Sudhir R. Patel, Tara Mobely,

LOCAL (2)

Chief Anthony Hall, 188 Rock Point Rd, Marietta PA 17547 FAX (717) 426-2001
Chief Jack Brommer, 308 Locust St, Columbia PA, 17512. FAX (717)- 684-6008

CC WITNESSES AND POTENTIAL FUTURE RESPONDENTS:

State Representative

The Honorable Brett Miller,
PA State Rep,
132 Locust St, unit 102.
Columbia PA.
FAX: 717-705-1946

(Deliberately positioned first as a position of High Honor and Integrity)

Federal Representing Pennsylvania

Lloyd Smucker,
US Congressman,
51 South Duke St, suite 201,
Lancaster PA 17602, fx (202) 225-2013
(Deliberately positioned first as a position of High Honor and Integrity)

John Fetterman,
US Congressman,
United States Senate 142 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510
Fax 717-782-3951

Bob Casey, Jr. ,
US SENATOR,
393 Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C. 20510,
Phone number(202) 224-6324
Fax (202) 228-0604

U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary

The Honorable Chuck Grassley (Chair) (R-IA)
224 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510
The Honorable Dick Durbin (Ranking Member) (D-IL)
The Honorable Lindsey Graham (R-SC)
The Honorable John Cornyn (R-TX)
The Honorable Mike Lee (R-UT)
The Honorable Ted Cruz (R-TX)
The Honorable Josh Hawley (R-MO)
The Honorable Thom Tillis (R-NC)
The Honorable John Kennedy (R-LA)
The Honorable Marsha Blackburn (R-TN)
The Honorable Tom Cotton (R-AR)
The Honorable Katie Britt (R-AL)
The Honorable Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
The Honorable Amy Klobuchar (D-MN)
The Honorable Chris Coons (D-DE)
The Honorable Richard Blumenthal (D-CT)
The Honorable Mazie Hirono (D-HI)
The Honorable Cory Booker (D-NJ)
The Honorable Alex Padilla (D-CA)
The Honorable Peter Welch (D-VT)
The Honorable Laphonza Butler (D-CA)

U.S. House Committee on the Judiciary

The Honorable Jim Jordan (Chair) (R-OH)

2138 Rayburn House Office Building

Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable Jamie Raskin (Ranking Member) (D-MD)

The Honorable Darrell Issa (R-CA)

The Honorable Andy Biggs (R-AZ)

The Honorable Tom McClintock (R-CA)

The Honorable Thomas Tiffany (R-WI)

The Honorable Thomas Massie (R-KY)

The Honorable Chip Roy (R-TX)

The Honorable Scott Fitzgerald (R-WI)

The Honorable Victoria Spartz (R-IN)

The Honorable Barry Moore (R-AL)

The Honorable Kevin Kiley (R-CA)

The Honorable Jerry Nadler (D-NY)

The Honorable Zoe Lofgren (D-CA)

The Honorable Mary Gay Scanlon (D-PA)

The Honorable Hank Johnson (D-GA)

The Honorable Ted Lieu (D-CA)

The Honorable Pramila Jayapal (D-WA)

The Honorable Joe Neguse (D-CO)

Pennsylvania Senate Judiciary Committee

The Honorable Lisa Baker (Chair) (R)

Senate Box 203020

Harrisburg, PA 17120-3020

The Honorable Gene Yaw (Vice Chair) (R)

The Honorable Amanda Cappelletti (Minority Chair) (D)

The Honorable Kim Ward (Ex-Officio) (R)

The Honorable Camera Bartolotta (R)

The Honorable Rosemary Brown (R)

The Honorable Cris Dush (R)

The Honorable Wayne Langerholc Jr. (R)

The Honorable Doug Mastriano (R)

The Honorable Tracy Pennycuick (R)

The Honorable Maria Collett (D)

The Honorable Art Haywood (D)

The Honorable Steve Santarsiero (D)

The Honorable Sharif Street (D)

The Honorable Nikil Saval (D)

The Honorable Jimmy Dillon (D)

Pennsylvania House Judiciary Committee

The Honorable Tim Briggs (Chair) (D)
P.O. Box 202149
Harrisburg, PA 17120-2149
The Honorable Joe Hamm (R)
The Honorable Timothy Bonner (R)
The Honorable Torren Ecker (R)
The Honorable Andrew Kuzma (R)
The Honorable Joshua Kail (R)
The Honorable Stephenie Scialabba (R)
The Honorable Jim Rigby (R)
The Honorable Andre Carroll (D)
The Honorable Kyle Donahue (D)
The Honorable Liz Hanbidge (D)
The Honorable Joseph Hohenstein (D)
The Honorable Kristine Howard (D)
The Honorable Malcolm Kenyatta (D)
The Honorable Emily Kinkead (D)

Federal Child Support Oversight - U.S. House Ways and Means Committee

The Honorable Jason Smith (Chair) (R-MO)
1102 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
The Honorable Richard Neal (Ranking Member) (D-MA)

Federal Child Support Oversight - U.S. Senate Finance Committee

The Honorable Mike Crapo (Chair) (R-ID)
219 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510
The Honorable Ron Wyden (Ranking Member) (D-OR)

Pennsylvania Domestic Relations Procedural Rules Committee

Committee Clerk
601 Commonwealth Avenue, Suite 6200
Harrisburg, PA 17106

United States District Court- Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Judge John Michael Gallagher
Clerk George V. Wylesol
James A. Byrne U.S. Courthouse
601 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106

Social Security Administration

Frank J. Bisignano (Commissioner)
6401 Security Boulevard
Baltimore, MD 21235
Mark Steffensen (General Counsel)
Jeffrey Shapiro (Inspector General)

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Robert F. Kennedy Jr. (Secretary)
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20201
Michael B. Stuart (General Counsel)
Christi A. Grimm (Inspector General)

Office of Child Support Services (HHS)

Linda Boyer (Acting Commissioner)
330 C Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20201

U.S. Department of Justice

The Honorable Pam Bondi (Attorney General)
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001
Sarah M. Harris (Acting Solicitor General)
Don R. Berthiaume (Acting Inspector General)

Federal Bureau of Investigation

Kash Patel (Director)
935 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20535-0001

Pennsylvania Office of State Inspector General

Michelle A. Henry (Inspector General)
555 Walnut Street, 8th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Pennsylvania Attorney General's Office

Dave Sunday (Attorney General)
1600 Strawberry Square
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Pennsylvania State Police

Christopher Paris (Commissioner)
1800 Elmerton Avenue
Harrisburg, PA 17110

Pennsylvania Bureau of Child Support Enforcement

Jaylene Bowers (Division Director)
P.O. Box 8018
Harrisburg, PA 17105

U.S. House Oversight Committee

The Honorable James Comer (Chair) (R-KY)
2157 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

US Department of State

Marco Rubio, Secretary of State. T
2201 C Street NW,
Washington, DC 20520.

Vermont Passport Agency

Michelle Cleare, director
50 South Main Street,
St. Albans, VT 05478

Government Accountability Office

Gene L. Dodaro (Comptroller General)
441 G Street, NW
Washington, DC 20548

U.S. Department of the Treasury

Scott Bessent (Secretary)
1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20220
Brian Morrissey (General Counsel)
J. Russell George (Inspector General)

Department of the Treasury Office of Executive Secretary (see page 160 for campus authorization)

1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Room 3413
Washington, DC 20220"

Internal Revenue Service

Scott Bessent (Acting Commissioner)
1111 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20224
Kenneth Kies (Acting Chief Counsel)
Heather M. Hill (Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration)

National Governors Association

Executive Director Bill McBride
444 North Capitol Street NW, Suite 267
Washington, D.C. 20001

U.S. Department of Defense

Pete Hegseth (Secretary)
1400 Defense Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301-1400
Earl G. Matthews (General Counsel)
Robert P. Storch (Inspector General)

Robert P. Storch,
Inspector General of the Department of Defense,
Office of Inspector General
4800 Mark Center Drive Alexandria, VA 22350-1500.
FAX 1-703-604-8567

DoD Hotline for Abuse Tips

DoD Hotline Director
4800 Mark Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22350-1500

Office of the President of the United States

The Honorable Donald J. Trump (President)
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20500
(deliberately positioned last as a position of high honor and authority)

“CONVOLUTED FEDERAL SUPREMACY”

PHASE I

LEGAL, FINANCIAL, AND COMMERCIAL CONSEQUENCES RESULTING FROM REICH V REICH FAMILY LAW MATTERS -AND CONSEQUENT ESCALATIONS- INITIATING AT THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

A TABLE FLIPPING AFFIDAVIT OF FACT, AFFIDAVIT OF PROBABLE CAUSE, AND NOTICE OF COMMERCIAL CLAIM FOR PROLONGED IRREPARABLE HARM DETAILING EXTENSIVE WRONGDOING OVER A FIVE YEAR PERIOD BY AN INTERSTATE BLACK COLLAR CARTEL COMPOSED OF ELECTED AND APPOINTED FEDERAL, STATE, AND JUDICIAL OFFICIALS OPERATING A HIGHLY SOPHISTICATED, BESPOKE, JUDICIALLY CRAFTED, DIABOLICALLY ENGINEERED CRIMINAL ENTERPRISE RELYING ON EXTENSIVE AND COMPLEX NESTED LAYERS OF STATE AND FEDERAL STATUTE AND REGULATIONS, SECRETIVE INTERSTATE CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENTS, PRIVATE INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENTS, AND EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENTS IN A SCHEME TO SWINDLE FEDERAL TITLE IV-D MONEY RESULTING IN HUMAN TRAFFICKING, INTERSTATE MONEY LAUNDERING AND RACKETEERING EFFECTUATED BY WAY OF HARD TO DETECT DAILY ACTS OF OMISSION AND COMMISSION IN THE FORM OF INTENTIONAL DEPRIVATION OF DUE PROCESS RELATED CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF VULNERABLE LITIGANTS, BETTER KNOWN AS THE HIGH CRIMES OF TREASON AND SEDITION, UNDER THE GUISE OF LAWFUL OPERATION OF GOVERNMENT OFFICE AT THE LEVEL OF FEDERAL, STATE, COUNTY, CCP, AND DRS LEADING TO COMMERCIAL DEFAULT AND PERSONAL LIABILITY FOR EXTENSIVE ULTRA VIRES WICKEDNESS AND WRONGDOING.

GOOD FAITH IMMUNITY INVOKED FOR BAD FAITH CRIMINAL ACTIVITY DENIED. PERSONAL LIABILITY EXPOSED AND ATTACHED.

DETAILS OF COMMERCIAL CLAIM, LIEN, COMMERCIAL DEFAULT, FURTHER COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH FURTHER ESCALATIONS DETAILED, AND THE TIMELINE AND COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH SETTLEMENT PROVIDED. ASCENT AND WAIVER BY SILENCE.

LEDGER ACCOUNTING ATTACHED. FULL SCALE ROUT AND JUSTICE FOR THE WICKED; INEVITABLE. PHASE II HINTS FOR THOSE THAT READ UNTIL THE END! STAY TUNED!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- DEDICATION TO RETIRED SENIOR JUDGE WILLIAM P MAHON
- “CONVOLUTED FEDERAL SUPREMACY” PHASE I
- TABLE OF CONTENTS
- TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
- SPEAKING TO COUNSEL
- INVOCATION OF DIVINE PROTECTION: SCRIPTURES OF ASSURANCE AND STRENGTH
- INTRODUCTION
- BIBLICAL AUTHORITY, ETERNAL LAW, AND THE WRATH OF THE ALMIGHTY: A FINAL WARNING TO WRONGDOERS AND CORRUPT JUDGES
- AFFIDAVIT OF FACT AND TRUTH
- CHILD SUPPORT STARTED STARTED LAWFULLY
- CONSTITUTIONAL AND CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATION OF FEDERAL SUPREMACY
- CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS RAISED
- KNOWINGLY FLAWED ARGUMENTS PRESENTED BY TREASONOUS DESPOT SENIOR RETIRED JUDGE WILLIAM P MAHON -
- KNOWINGLY FLAWED ARGUMENTS PRESENTED BY TREASONOUS DESPOT SENIOR JUDGE EDWARD D. REIBMAN -
- JUDICIAL IMMUNITY: GAVEL ATTACHED (NOT THE ROBE)
- AFFIDAVIT OF PROBABLE CAUSE FORMALITIES
- AFFIDAVIT OF PROBABLE CAUSE
- NOTICE AND DEMAND
- CEASE AND DESIST
- FOIA “REQUEST”
- NOTICE OF INCURRED FINANCIAL DAMAGES
- ESCALATING DAMAGE COSTS
- CLAIM FOR DAMAGES GENERALLY
- DECONVOLUTING STANDARD METHODS TO CALCULATE BASE, INCIDENTAL, CONSEQUENTIAL, AND COMMON LAW DAMAGES
- SCHEDULE OF COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH HARM
- CLAIM FOR DAMAGES SPECIFICALLY
- DISTRIBUTION OF DAMAGES AND FULL LEDGER ACCOUNTING
- NOTICE OF LIEN UNDER UCC-1
- NOTICE OF REQUIREMENT FOR REBUTTAL AFFIDAVIT AND INTENT TO FILE UCC-1
- YOU HAVE ALREADY DEFAULTED
- YOU PROVIDE(D) THREE FORMS OF CONSENT
- ENFORCEMENT
- FEDERAL TREASURY OFFSET: THE ENFORCEMENT STAGE
- TREASURY AUTHORIZATION AND LIMITED POWER OF ATTORNEY

- AUTHORIZATION FOR CAMPUS TO SETTLE THE ACCOUNT ACCOUNT OF A TAXPAYER USING NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENTS LIKE A BILL OF EXCHANGE OR REGISTERED BILL OF EXCHANGE
- AN OLIVE BRANCH
- SHOULD YOU REFUSE: CONTINUOUS ADVANCEMENT OF THE “LET GO” PROCESS
- IF YOU DO NOT SETTLE OR ASSIST IN THE CLOSURE THEN OPERATION OF LAW PROCEEDS WITHOUT YOU
- FAFO
- NOTICE OF RESTRAINT AND PHASE II
- SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION
- LET THE WOOKIE WIN
- RIGHTEOUS STEPS OF REDEMPTION
- GRAND JURY
- DISCLAIMER
- DECLARATION AND 28 USC 1746
- APPENDIX
- DEFICIENCIES AND IRREGULARITIES
- A SAMPLING OF NOTICE AND ORDERS
- LETTERS AND JUDICIAL NOTICE

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Family Law

Cases

- Boddie v. Connecticut, 401 U.S. 371 (1971): Access to courts in divorce proceedings without undue financial barriers.
- Ball v. Minnick, 414 N.W.2d 180 (Minn. Ct. App. 1987): Child support obligations not intended as punishment.
- Bounds v. Smith, 430 U.S. 817 (1977): Access to courts for inmates, extending to family matters.
- Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954): Desegregation in education, applicable to family law biases.
- Christopher v. Harbury, 536 U.S. 403 (2002): Access to courts denied by deception.
- Cleveland Board of Education v. Loudermill, 470 U.S. 532 (1985): Pre-deprivation hearings for public employees, applied to family deprivations.
- Com. v. Haigh, 874 A.2d 1174 (Pa. Super. Ct. 2005): PFAs not tools for custody leverage.
- Doe v. Purdue University, 928 F.3d 652 (7th Cir. 2019): Equal protection in disciplinary proceedings.
- Ettinger v. Ettinger, 637 P.2d 9 (Colo. 1981): Equal custody for fit parents.
- Fuentes v. Shevin, 407 U.S. 67 (1972): Pre-seizure hearings for property.
- Goldberg v. Kelly, 397 U.S. 254 (1970): Due process in welfare benefits termination.
- Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972): Liberal construction of pro se pleadings.
- Hartman v. Moore, 547 U.S. 250 (2006): Retaliation for exercising First Amendment rights.
- In re Olive, 447 U.S. 902 (1980): Access to courts for pro se litigants.
- Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319 (1976): Due process balancing test.
- Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 U.S. 390 (1923): Parental rights to direct upbringing.
- Mississippi University for Women v. Hogan, 458 U.S. 718 (1982): Gender discrimination in education.
- Orr v. Orr, 440 U.S. 268 (1979): Gender-neutral alimony.
- Parham v. J.R., 442 U.S. 584 (1979): Parental rights in child medical decisions.
- Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 268 U.S. 510 (1925): Parental rights to direct education.
- Prince v. Massachusetts, 321 U.S. 158 (1944): State interest in child welfare limited.
- Quilloin v. Walcott, 434 U.S. 246 (1978): Fit parent presumption in adoption.
- Reed v. Reed, 404 U.S. 71 (1971): Gender discrimination in estate administration.
- Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113 (1973): Privacy rights (overruled but cited for due process).
- Ryland v. Shapiro, 708 F.2d 967 (5th Cir. 1983): Access to courts in wrongful death.
- Santosky v. Kramer, 455 U.S. 745 (1982): Clear evidence for parental termination.
- Sinclair v. Sinclair, 196 Kan. 667, 413 P.2d 1029 (1966): Equitable distribution in divorce.
- Smith v. Barry, 985 F.2d 180 (4th Cir. 1993): Access to courts.
- Stanley v. Illinois, 405 U.S. 645 (1972): Presumption of parental fitness.
- Tennessee v. Lane, 541 U.S. 509 (2004): Access to courts under ADA.
- Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57 (2000): Parental rights to direct upbringing.

Turner v. Rogers, 564 U.S. 431 (2011): Due process in support contempt.
Village of Willowbrook v. Olech, 528 U.S. 562 (2000): Equal protection for individuals.
West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette, 319 U.S. 624 (1943): Free exercise in education.
Wisconsin v. Yoder, 406 U.S. 205 (1972): Religious freedom in upbringing.
Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37 (1971): Abstention from state proceedings.

Statutes

U.S. Constitution, Article VI: Supremacy Clause, federal law preemption.
1st Amendment: Free speech and petition rights.
5th Amendment: Due process and takings protections.
13th Amendment: Prohibition of slavery and involuntary servitude.
14th Amendment: Due process and equal protection.
28 U.S.C. § 1367: Supplemental jurisdiction.
28 U.S.C. § 1654: Pro se representation.
28 U.S.C. § 1738B: Full faith and credit for child support.
28 U.S.C. § 1746: Unsworn declarations.
28 U.S.C. § 2071: Rulemaking power.
42 U.S.C. § 654: State plans for child support.
42 U.S.C. § 666: Child support enforcement.
42 U.S.C. § 1983: Civil action for rights deprivation.
Pa. Const. Art. I, § 11: Open courts.
Pa.R.C.P. 227.1: Post-trial relief.
Pa.R.C.P. 1023.1: Signing certifications.
Pa.R.C.P. 1901.5: PFA procedures.
Pa.R.C.P. 1910.16: Support guidelines.
Pa.R.C.P. 1915.4: Custody procedures.
Pa.R.C.P. 1915.10: Custody decisions.
Pa.R.C.P. 1920.51: Divorce hearings.
23 Pa.C.S. § 4301: Duties of support.
23 Pa.C.S. § 4352: Support enforcement.
23 Pa.C.S. § 5328: Custody factors.
23 Pa.C.S. § 6107: PFA hearings.
Public Law 93-647: Social Services Amendments of 1974 (Child Support Enforcement Amendments).
Public Law 97-280: Joint resolution designating 1983 as the "Year of the Bible" and affirming Biblical teachings as foundational to U.S. law.

Regulations

45 C.F.R. § 302.10: State plan requirements.
45 C.F.R. § 302.56: Support guidelines.
45 C.F.R. § 302.70: Custody procedures.
45 C.F.R. § 303.8: Reviews and adjustments.
45 C.F.R. § 303.100: Enforcement procedures.

45 C.F.R. § 303.101: Expedited processes.
45 C.F.R. § 304.20: Funding availability.
55 Pa. Code § 3140.21: Due process in family services.

Criminal Law

Cases

Bradley v. Fisher, 80 U.S. (13 Wall.) 335 (1871): Judicial immunity limited to good-faith acts.
Com. v. Bolden, 472 Pa. 602, 373 A.2d 90 (1977): Officials must follow constitutional mandates.
Duncan v. Louisiana, 391 U.S. 145 (1968): Right to jury trial in serious offenses.
Ex parte Virginia, 100 U.S. 339 (1880): Judges liable for discriminatory acts.
Forrester v. White, 484 U.S. 219 (1988): No immunity for administrative acts.
H.J. Inc. v. Northwestern Bell Telephone Co., 492 U.S. 229 (1989): RICO pattern requirements.
Hovey v. Elliott, 167 U.S. 409 (1897): No denial of defense for contempt.
Imbler v. Pachtman, 424 U.S. 409 (1976): Immunity for prosecutors in official acts.
Mireles v. Waco, 502 U.S. 9 (1991): Immunity limited to judicial acts.
Monell v. Department of Social Services of City of New York, 436 U.S. 658 (1978): Municipal liability for policy violations.
Plaut v. Spendthrift Farm, Inc., 514 U.S. 211 (1995): No legislative reopening of final judgments.
Pulliam v. Allen, 466 U.S. 522 (1984): Injunctive relief against judicial acts.
Randall v. Brigham, 74 U.S. (7 Wall.) 523 (1869): No immunity for malicious acts.
Reves v. Ernst & Young, 507 U.S. 170 (1993): RICO participation requirements.
Schlib v. Kuebel, 404 U.S. 357 (1971): Excessive bail amounts.
Sedima v. Imrex Co., 473 U.S. 479 (1985): RICO civil claims.
Stump v. Sparkman, 435 U.S. 349 (1978): Immunity for judicial acts.
United States v. Dann, 873 F.2d 1189 (9th Cir. 1989): Forced labor prohibitions.
United States v. Guest, 383 U.S. 745 (1966): Conspiracy against rights.
United States v. Kozminski, 487 U.S. 931 (1988): Involuntary servitude.
United States v. Price, 383 U.S. 787 (1966): Conspiracy against rights.
United States v. Throckmorton, 98 U.S. 61 (1878): Fraud voids judgments.
Walton v. Arizona, 497 U.S. 639 (1990): Due process in sentencing.

Statutes

5 U.S.C. § 552: Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), public information disclosure.
18 U.S.C. § 3: Accessory after the fact.
18 U.S.C. § 241: Conspiracy against rights.
18 U.S.C. § 242: Deprivation of rights under color of law.
18 U.S.C. § 1001: False statements.
18 U.S.C. § 1341: Mail fraud.
18 U.S.C. § 1343: Wire fraud.
18 U.S.C. § 1346: Honest services fraud.
18 U.S.C. § 1503: Obstruction of justice.
18 U.S.C. § 1505: Obstruction of proceedings.
18 U.S.C. § 1512: Witness tampering.

18 U.S.C. § 1513: Retaliation against witness.
18 U.S.C. § 1581: Peonage.
18 U.S.C. § 1589: Forced labor.
18 U.S.C. § 1590: Trafficking for labor.
18 U.S.C. § 1621: Perjury.
18 U.S.C. § 1951: Hobbs Act extortion.
18 U.S.C. § 1956: Money laundering.
18 U.S.C. § 1957: Monetary transactions in criminal property.
18 U.S.C. § 1961: RICO definitions.
18 U.S.C. § 1962: RICO prohibited activities.
18 U.S.C. § 1964: RICO civil remedies.
18 U.S.C. § 2381: Treason.
18 U.S.C. § 2384: Seditious conspiracy.
28 U.S.C. § 455: Judicial disqualification.
31 U.S.C. § 3729: False Claims Act.
65 P.S. § 67.101: Pennsylvania Right-to-Know Law.
18 Pa.C.S. § 903: Criminal conspiracy.
18 Pa.C.S. § 2701: Assault.
18 Pa.C.S. § 2709: Harassment.
18 Pa.C.S. § 2901: Kidnapping.
18 Pa.C.S. § 2904: Interference with custody.
18 Pa.C.S. § 3921: Theft by unlawful taking.
18 Pa.C.S. § 4902: Perjury.
18 Pa.C.S. § 4952: Intimidation of witnesses.
18 Pa.C.S. § 5101: Obstructing administration of law.
18 Pa.C.S. § 5105: Hindering apprehension.
18 Pa.C.S. § 5301: Official oppression.

Commercial Law

Cases

Hanna v. Plumer, 380 U.S. 460 (1965): Federal rules govern in diversity cases.
Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co., 322 U.S. 238 (1944): Fraud voids judgments.
Kramer v. Caribbean Mills, 394 U.S. 823 (1969): Forum non conveniens in federal courts.
Silvestri v. General Motors Corp., 271 F.3d 583 (4th Cir. 2001): Spoliation of evidence.
Throckmorton v. Holt, 180 U.S. 552 (1901): Fraud voids judgments.
Zubulake v. UBS Warburg LLC, 229 F.R.D. 422 (S.D.N.Y. 2004): Spoliation sanctions.

Statutes

UCC § 1-202: Notice requirements.
UCC § 1-203: Good faith.
UCC § 1-304: Good faith obligation.
UCC § 1-305: Remedies.
UCC § 1-308: Performance with reservation.

UCC § 2-302: Unconscionable contracts.
UCC § 2-715: Consequential damages.
UCC § 3-305: Defenses to instruments.
UCC § 3-420: Conversion.
UCC § 3-501: Presentment.
UCC § 9-601: Rights after default.
UCC § 9-609: Secured party possession.
UCC § 9-625: Remedies for noncompliance.
13 Pa.C.S. § 1202: Notice.
13 Pa.C.S. § 1203: Good faith.
13 Pa.C.S. § 1304: Good faith obligation.
13 Pa.C.S. § 1309: Disclosure.
13 Pa.C.S. § 2302: Unconscionable contracts.
13 Pa.C.S. § 3305: Defenses to instruments.
13 Pa.C.S. § 3420: Conversion.
13 Pa.C.S. § 9601: Rights after default.
13 Pa.C.S. Ch. 11 et seq. (Uniform Commercial Code Article 1 - General Provisions, including definitions).
13 Pa.C.S. Ch. 21 et seq. (Uniform Commercial Code Article 2 - Sales).
13 Pa.C.S. Ch. 2A1 et seq. (Uniform Commercial Code Article 2A - Leases).
13 Pa.C.S. Ch. 31 et seq. (Uniform Commercial Code Article 3 - Negotiable Instruments).
13 Pa.C.S. Ch. 91 et seq. (Uniform Commercial Code Article 9 - Secured Transactions).

Other

Restatement (Second) of Contracts § 208: Unconscionable contracts.

SPEAKING TO COUNSEL

David and Sonya,

I'm writing to you as the legal representatives of the existing Defendants of a pending matter in Federal District Court. I'm also writing to you in regards to associated "respondents" referenced herein who I consider collaborators and conspirators with what I deem a "Black Collar Cartel."

The Black Collar Cartel ("Cartel") is a group of elected and appointed officials in the Federal and State Government who collaborate with state judiciaries to effect a laundry list of crimes by way of intentional deprivation of constitutional rights. This is a direct assault on the US Constitution and State Constitution, an act of treason and sedition, and a very poor idea. It's a war against Americans and replete with war crimes. The perpetrators don't primarily use guns, though they are the threat of enforcement of unlawful orders. Instead the Cartel uses deprivation of constitutional rights, knowingly unlawful orders, and collectively their actions are Crimes Against Humanity on a massive scale.

Their legal actions knowingly violated the US Constitution, international treaties on human rights, federal statutes, federal regulations, Federal Court rules. Their legal actions also knowingly violated matching state Constitution, state statutes, state regulations, and state and local court rules. They knowingly operated as an unregistered corporate entity and violated commercial laws. They're judges. They know this. They never expected to be held accountable, and yet here we are.

Collectively, these Respondents who form the Black Collar Cartel are effectively operating a human trafficking, interstate money laundering, and racketeering enterprise. It's effectuated by Family Law judges, the boots on the ground of this operation, who intentionally deprive litigants of Due Process and then subsequently, inter alia, deny them their fundamental liberties to acquire, possess, and protect property and to care, custody and control their children. The entire scheme works primarily by covertly depriving (omission) fathers going through divorce of constitutional rights they don't know they have, and then issuing unlawful orders (commission) that maximize extraction of interstate Title IV-D funds, which on the surface appear statutorily compliant, but underneath that surface are constitutionally unfathomably deficient and irregular. They're routinely committing securities fraud, negotiable instrument fraud, mail fraud, wire fraud, as a pattern of racketeering behavior as well as facilitating things like kidnapping, extortion, interference of custody, and an extensive list of crimes consolidated and explained in the Affidavit of Probable Cause section.

This scheme has been incredibly difficult to detect and unravel and it's only after putting in five years of essentially non-stop fighting the court that I've figured out how it operates. The scheme is diabolically engineered by incredibly talented attorneys who serve as judges and executed throughout the entire state judiciary. The operation is obscured by:

- The sheer size of the federal and state statutes and regulations as well as the size of the judicial bureaucracy.
- Nested secretive interstate and intrastate contracts between Federal, State, and County agencies and offices.
- The cartel has interagency agreements with offices and agents like District Attorneys and State Attorney Generals, which makes enforcing the law against the people breaking the law who also happen to administer the law quite a significant challenge.
- The amount of resistance by judges to challenges by litigants. The judges literally gas light litigants that judicial actions that are blatantly illegal, unlawful, and unconstitutional are somehow legal and lawful and the litigant in question is instead treated disingenuously as some version of crazy, a sovereign citizen, arguing something frivolous or some other argument meant to chill the concerned litigant from their right to grievances or their presentment of criminal concerns.
- Support from State and Federal Courts, which support their judicial brethren by disingenuous court actions like: clerical obstruction, knowingly incorrect judicial orders, non-compliant judicial orders, silence in the face of extensive law breaking, and bad faith adjudication generally and specifically towards the protection of other judges acting unlawfully.

Having now received some of the secretive interstate contracts I see how on one hand they “Affirm Federal Supremacy” but on the other hand incentivize anything but. Money flows, inter alia, to those that have the most expenses, lowest arrearages, and the highest amount of support collected. There are no payments or benefits to lawfully adjudicate these matters, and in fact applying principles of Federal Supremacy results in financial penalties. They talk about Federal Supremacy, but the contracts payout for disregarding it. Take a guess if the judges appreciate the talk or the pay more.

The primary trick going on in the courtroom is depriving litigants, especially breadwinning fathers, of fundamental fairness, due notice, substantive and procedural due process rights, neutral arbitration, and equal protection. Your average father going through family law has no idea what that’s supposed to look like when they’re in court. They can feel the unfairness in their bones as family law devastates their family, but they can’t explain why it creates such a terrible experience and disastrous outcome. It’s like being a child standing in the wreckage of the aftermath of Hiroshima and not being able to comprehend what just happened but seeing devastation everywhere. The court is preying on this ignorance and instead of being a neutral arbiter applying statute under the constraints of the US and State Constitution they are instead intentionally depriving litigants of their rights, adjudicating matters in such a way to maximize interstate reimbursement of Title IV-D funds for the cartel, and are essentially destroying innocent nuclear families while acting as treasonous felons with a motive of money.

The only way to figure out that this is even happening is to learn the requirements of 14th Amendment derived Fundamental Fairness, Substantive and Procedural Due Process of Law, and Equal Protection, but that’s challenging because it’s spread out over ~150 years of US Supreme Court Case law. There isn’t one central repository referenced anywhere by the state

and parts of this case law are overturned or at times conflicting. Implementation can also change depending on fact and circumstance. So, the cartel is ingeniously operating by preying on the ignorance of the litigant based on a complicated topic spread out over 150 years and covering thousands of pages of dense legal material.

Figuring this out has been intensely difficult and time consuming. Most people can't put in the time or have the skill or knowledge to attempt this. Most fathers can't do that while being ravaged in state court by a cartel. There's only a tiny fraction of people that could even figure this out. Honestly, kudos to the cartel. This thing is diabolical and professional grade quality. Deprive litigants of rights they don't know they have, meet statutory requirements so it looks valid at a state level, and twist judgement for maximum cartel and personal gain rather than what's best or right for the parties in the lawsuit. No wonder it's stood for decades while openly destroying men and their families.

Fortunately for me I'm a diligent scholar even under duress. Chemistry is an absurdly and unnecessarily brutal field and I studied under a detail oriented man who used condescension like a whip to discourage mistakes even for simple errors. Also, I was told by the single most ruthless Inorganic Chemistry professor who ever lived, Dr. F. A. Cotton, author of thousands of papers and who literally wrote the book "Inorganic Chemistry" who was near the end of his life, that I was one of the best students he ever taught. I'm uniquely experienced and have already come out successful in the face of having to consume dense material under intense pressure.

Doing this once as a younger man with less life experience left me scarred and broken. It took a decade to heal. Doing this a second time with that experience at my back, broken and repaired, and with my family, fortune, and future on the line, is like riding a bike in a formerly challenging neighborhood. I remember this. I've done this before. I got this, I'm Blair Reich, PhD and I can do this again without breaking this time. Some might even say that I was Divinely guided, custom built, and descended here to righteously fight this wicked cartel.

What I have discovered and uncovered through my hermit-like stroll through 150 years of law and intense study of those thousands of pages of US Case Law backed by matching study of statute, regulation, and rules at both the Federal and State level is that the US Constitution is clear that the Constitution is the Supreme Law of the land. That Supreme Law includes Fundamental Fairness as applied in State Courts against State actors. The Constitution and the US Supreme Court Case law about it dictate the protections I get and the restrictions that restrain lawful judges while adjudicating matters.

I'm due a long list of Substantive and Procedural Due Process Protections and Equal Protection. I call that list the "DOs." The state is prevented from enacting certain methods and practices. I call that list the "DON'T's." Collectively they are the DOs and DON'Ts of Federal Supremacy. There's likely more than what I detail herein, but what I detail herein is more than enough to show that the Cartel is operating in bad faith and is intentionally breaking the law.

Let's review; I have fundamental rights and liberties. I have authored and clarified a substantial portion of the "DOs and DONT's" for judges. These are most important when the court attempts to abridge my Fundamental Liberties. There's some amount of flexibility in the process because there's a spectrum of rights and not every right is treated equally and as happens in law everything is a matter of facts and circumstances (and performance). The best quote talking about the balance of fundamental liberty interests and their abridgement is a dissenting opinion from *Poe v Ullman*, which has since been pulled into later majority opinions of the Supreme Court-

". . . [T]he full scope of the liberty guaranteed by the Due Process Clause cannot be found in or limited by the precise terms of the specific guarantees elsewhere provided in the Constitution. This 'liberty' is not a series of isolated points pricked out in terms of the taking of property; the freedom of speech, press, and religion; the right to keep and bear arms; the freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures; and so on. It is a rational continuum which, broadly speaking, includes a freedom from all substantial arbitrary impositions and purposeless restraints, . . . and which also recognizes what a reasonable and sensitive judgment must, that certain interests require particularly careful scrutiny of the state needs asserted to justify their abridgment." *Poe v. Ullman*, supra at 367 U. S. 542-543 (dissenting opinion).

In addition to various Substantive Rights that have been defined in US SUPREME COURT case law opinions there are also Substantive Rights that are defined in State Case Law. Things like support orders cannot be "oppressive" or "confiscatory" are defined in state case law, and mark specific substantive rights afforded to Pennsylvanians by Pennsylvanian binding case law (as opposed to Federal binding case law).

There are three Substantive Rights defined by Federal Case Law I want to mention in particular as these are the most pertinent to family law and apply to every litigant in Protection from Abuse (other states call it Protection from Domestic Violence or Restraining Orders), Divorce, Custody and Support-

- 14th Amendment Section 1 Right to Due Process of Law: effectively the right to JUSTICE.
- Fundamental Liberty to Care, Custody, and Control Children (*Troxel V Granville* (2000))
- Fundamental Liberty to Acquire, Possess, and Protect Property (*Vanhorne's Lessee v. Dorrance*, 2 U.S. 304 (1795))

The State through its Police Powers and as *Parens Patriae* is permitted to abridge those rights and liberties, but only where there is a **compelling** state interest in the matter(s). Specifically, I have the Fundamental Liberty to acquire, possess, and protect property as well as the fundamental liberty to care, custody, and control my children. It is nearly impossible for the state to achieve a **compelling** state interest that would enable the state to abridge my liberties because I am Fit Parent.

Being a fit parent requires meeting an extremely low bar. Essentially a parent is a Fit Parent if they aren't putting their child in grave and immediate threat or long standing neglect. The state essentially has no compelling interest allowing them to interfere unless there is a clear and present danger of immediate bodily harm or death. The Fit Parent standard is so low that even parents who appear to occasionally go over the line into unfit parenting practice may still not be declared unfit until a long period is demonstrated and the child is routinely in grave danger.

If the state wants to take a child from their biological parents they lawfully require a finding of unfitness in a pre-deprivation hearing. This is also true if a state wants to take property from a parent because taking money or property from me and giving it to my spouse curtails my property rights and also my religious freedom and parental liberty. If you're going to abridge 3 or more fundamental rights/liberties at once it better pass "particularly careful scrutiny." Fleecing dads for Title IV-D money laundering, securities and negotiable instrument fraud, and basic theft purposes does not rise to that standard.

If the government is going to take something from a fit parent it constitutionally requires a compelling state interest, and even though a state statute says the state or court can do something that statute's authority and the judicial authority is curtailed by the US and State constitution when there's a conflict. That hierarchy is a result of Federal Supremacy as opposed to state statute supremacy (which isn't a thing).

In regards to the instant matters and my particular facts and circumstances- I have been declared a Fit Parent by a psychiatrist in 2021 when I voluntarily underwent a psychological evaluation in anticipation of my wife's false claims of mental unwellness stemming from a period of alcohol induced bipolar disorder (I've been alcohol and symptom free since 2015), and ironically I also meet the requirements as plainly stated by the very judges who abridge my liberties. They openly state that I meet the admittedly low, bare bones requirements of a Fit Parent.

When Fit Parents are involved the state interest has already been set by the Supreme Court (Quilloin) as Di Minimus. So, whereas a state may in some cases have the subject matter jurisdiction and authority to abridge fundamental liberty interests generally they do not have that ability in my matters and act ULTRA VIRES if they do it anyway. The Supreme Court has circumscribed their jurisdiction and authority. They can't lawfully swing the gavel in ways the Supreme Court has already told them are forbidden. A state court judge does not have the authority to remove a child from a Parent without a finding of unfitness via a pre-deprivation hearing or an immediate, grave, clear and present danger. And YES, they do it anyway, and thus we find ourselves in conflict. Expensive conflict...

So, while the State has statutes on family law, and those state statutes dictate procedure around the "Best Interest Standard" for custody, "Income Shares Model" for support, or blatantly unconstitutional process of having essentially no clear process regarding the legal fiction process of equitable distribution (or community property in communist leaning states); statute in

the state is not enough. What may appear as a lawful and statutorily compliant order in the course of family law is likely monumentally unconstitutional.

State Courts and State Legislatures don't get to randomly redefine how property works just because someone got married. They can't take my property just because we're getting divorced. They can't kick me out of my home because my Wife is upset during a divorce or exploiting asymmetric application of the law in family law. My titled property rights are God Granted, constitutionally protected, and do not stem from state statute and are my **unalienable** rights. Unalienable rights are not waived under a deceptive marriage license. You can't accidentally waive unalienable rights and you can't waive rights due to bad faith trickery, unlawful order, and fraud.

In case of confusion: let me deconvolute Federal Supremacy. It means that my God-granted constitutional rights trump your state statute. So, unless I'm unfit and posing a clear and present danger then the state interest is di minimus, no compelling state interest exists, and you can't lawfully abridge my fundamental liberty interests. Yet Respondents do it anyways. They further protect those who are conspirators and obstructors, felons, and treasonous despots. And so we find ourselves with mounting claims of obstruction or accessory after the fact to a root problem of Treason and Sedition. The core of their scheme relies on intentional deprivation of constitutional rights as step 1. They war on the Constitution itself. The state court judges are treasonous and seditious and anyone conspiring with them have misprision of felony, misprision of treason, conspiracy, and obstruction hanging over their heads and tying them to crimes against humanity on an unfathomable scale.

This is an uncomfortable position to be in for all of us. I'm being irreparably harmed. Respondents are causing expensive irreparable harm and also committing a mind-boggling number of criminal offenses to supplement their Treason and Sedition. A good portion of this Affidavit is dedicated to exploring the pain and irreparable harm to me and the consequences of this unfathomably bad faith scheme by Respondents to Respondents who refuse to abide by Federal Supremacy apparently because it's too convoluted. What's worse is that this abuse is ubiquitous and that means it's infecting a rather large portion of the federal and state government. More on that soon...

The Black Collar Cartel that you represent is operating under the veneer of Lawful Government and Lawful Government Office, but the actions taken by Respondents are wholly unlawful. The Court of Common Pleas has been transformed to a Mother Worshipping Cult of Common Thieves as the court is almost always financially aligned with granting every ridiculous request by mothers. The process of child support which was lawfully meant to protect the public from private harm has inverted and now preys upon the public to protect private unlawful gain. Public law enforcement has turned into cartel henchmen. Laws once meant to protect the public at large from the private obligations of deadbeat parents milking public assistance are now purposefully misused and an administrative state has formed around milking divorcing families

for many billions of dollars while they're already going through an incredibly painful process of dissolving their marriage.

Mothers and attorneys aren't off the hook. Instead of looking critically as to why nearly every single decision seems to favor them they psychotically lean into the process. They ask for the absurd and it's routinely granted. They play victims of father's natural response to say "no" to such unreasonable requests, but underneath the thin disguise of victimhood they're actually coconspirators asking a cartel to help them punish their husbands. Maximum aggression, like ambulance chasers, at all times by wives and their attorneys is a wise adaptation to the cartel law, but a poor adaptation to staying innocent of cartel crimes. In my particulars I told my wife and her attorney how all of this works and said if they continue to participate beyond the bare minimum I would charge them with conspiracy. They retaliated by putting in complaints of contempt because I'm "only" paying the Federal Minimum while adjudicating these matters as a way to stave off physical harm and more unlawful imprisonment. As I shared with these delightful ladies before, I'm accusing them of cartel conspiracy.

Ultimately, the people effectuating this scheme are judges and they know exactly what they are doing. Judge Bill Mahon is playing possum when he's idiotically arguing that any stupid contract he references could possibly outrank the US Constitution. Reibman is similarly idiotically and disingenuously arguing that my position in my State Habeas Corpus suit is about family law as opposed to the extensive civil rights violations and crimes stemming from their unconstitutional orders and actions.

These malfeasant foes know the harm they are causing. They are doing it deliberately. Their defense is composed of lies, deceit, misapplication of good law, unlawful orders, obstruction, gas lighting, and retaliation. Wickedness and Wrongdoing. They deal solely/souly in wickedness and wrongdoing.

I've provided an astonishingly large amount of Due Notice in a wide variety of forms over the past five years regarding their wickedness and wrongdoing. I stuff the Docket with hundreds of pages of researched material that details the very rights they are trampling, the way they trample them, and detail how it's all illegal. I'm not a professional attorney, but at this point I don't fear a Bar Card or Judge. That doesn't stop them from harming me. Conversely, when I stand my ground they escalate and retaliate.

Since respondents are acting as an unregistered and unincorporated enterprise and sprawling conglomerate I'll treat it as such and herein state the old maxim that "Notice to Principal is notice to Agent, and Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal." While my personal knowledge at this present time extends only to the Lancaster County Franchise of this conglomerate as well as the related centralized Pennsylvania and Federal portions of operations I note for the record that I believe this enterprise extends well past the geographic boundaries of Lancaster County. That's part of why my FOIA requests (see below) are not just geographically bound to Lancaster County. This scheme operates far and wide and I feel an altruistic compulsion to end this abuse not just for me, but all fathers who are similarly situated. We'll touch more on that at the end of

this where I talk about Phase II after these FOIAs expand my personal knowledge and provide evidence of the size and scope of this operation across state and federal lines.

To be clear; there are perverse incentives placed inside of interstate State Plans between Federal HHS and State DHS, there are perverse incentives placed inside intrastate COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS, there are perverse incentives placed inside intergovernmental agency agreements, and I haven't seen one yet, but I believe the exact same perverse incentives are inside individual employment agreements. These contracts exist in every state, practically every county, and form the basis of the personal incentive scheme to commit crime that interlocks the Cartel. The main interstate contract is signed by the Governor of the state. I don't think I'd feel terribly secure in my job or status knowing that I signed one of these contracts or state plans...

The cartel is operating a racketing operation in plain sight. It is admittedly hard to detect because it is mostly operating by way of covert omission of rights average Americans do not understand they have and producing statutorily compliant outcomes that fail to meet constitutional requirements and restrictions. Every divorcing Dad feels this across the country.

Modern men aren't sharing on social media that "divorce is hell except for Cook County Illinois!" No, the problem of family law being a predatory crime ring operated by Treasonous judicial officials is ubiquitous because the laws are based on federal statutes and regulations as well as interstate contracts that are mostly consistent from state to state. Thus the same scheme operates across the entire country, and I smell large amounts of liability from Governors all the way down to accountants and conference officers in the county DRS. It's all interconnected. They're all breaking tenets of Federal Supremacy, and they're all building up liability.

The US Constitution is clear that it is the Supreme Law, and that all other courts and laws are subordinate. However; in what I think is the most brazen quote in all of this, Retired Senior Judge William P Mahon, personal agent of Pennsylvania Supreme Court Chief Justice Debra Todd describes how a tiny section of the COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT supersedes the Constitution and I quote "**Convoluting Federal Supremacy.**" These morons are risking their lives harming people for money while clothed in the color of law and seemingly have faith that basing their operations on interstate contracts having more authority than the US Constitution is going to pan out for them. Hint: it isn't.

Discovering this whole scheme was hard. Now that it's exposed it's easy to spot. In the section of "DOs and DONT's" just look at words there and then look at family law orders. If there aren't words like "Mathews Balancing Test" then there isn't a lawful abridgement of fundamental liberty interests. Figuring out the quintessential omission for the first time took five years of non-stop research by an extremely dedicated and battle tested litigant. Applying it from here on out can be done by a third grader doing word matching between two documents.

The amount of liability here is unfathomable. There's hundreds of thousands of fathers entering family law every year. There's tens of millions of orders outstanding. This scheme has been

operating for decades. Every case and every order is a monumental liability: they're all illegal, all unlawful, all based on fraud, all unconstitutional, all are against Federal Supremacy, all can be discovered by word matching, all represent Treason and Sedition as well as crimes against humanity, and all are about to lead to complications. It turns out the real problem of Convoluted Federal Supremacy is unwinding the gargantuan judicial and cartel liability and criminality produced along the way.

When the court issues bad orders across various aspects of domestic law they all lead to the same place of effectuating the cartel scheme rather than lawful adjudication of family matters. This impacts restraining orders, distribution, custody, and support. In the hands of a cartel state judge-

- Restraining orders are granted to weaken men and place them in immediate financial danger with threats of incarceration to enforce compliance with unreasonable and unconstitutional support orders without actual or reasonable threats present to wives,
- Orders for bifurcation are routinely denied to keep men trapped in the scheme
- Non-compliant orders for distribution that unlawfully cripple men are issued to chill and weaken them from an ability to fight back,
- Asymmetric custody orders are issued to maximize Title IV-D recovery as asymmetric custody statutorily leads to higher Title IV-D limits,
- Child support orders are designed to siphon interstate money and facilitate interstate money laundering,
- Child support collected isn't fully dispersed to mothers and there's a delta between the money coming in and out, which indicates theft and separate type of fraud,
- The illegal orders facilitate crimes like kidnapping and interference with custody,
- The resulting orders are wire fraud, and then sent through the mail resulting in mail fraud,
- People complicit with this system are generally guilty of obstruction, conspiracy, dereliction of duty, perjury (of oath), official oppression, retaliation, witness intimidation, and other smaller crimes as part of the conspiracy with the high of Treason and Sedition.
- When they commit small crimes they are then conspirators with the larger crimes.

Just so we're all clear; the state courts are *constitutionally* bound by Federal Supremacy. The state courts for child support are *contractually* bound to their "Affirmation of Federal Supremacy." Judges can play dumb all they want, but they stated Oaths to Defend the Constitution and they signed contracts that affirm Federal Supremacy (Section 9 of the COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT). These people are monsters, know better than practically everyone else on the planet the extent of wrongdoing and illegality they are engaged in, and they do it anyway because no one stands up to them in the face of such massive abuse of power, out right Treason and Sedition by the Judiciary who is the primary fiduciary supposed to protect Americans from said Treason and Sedition, and the complexity of the judicially crafted scheme.

Well... almost no one.

By sending you this letter I consider Due Notice and Service to the Lancaster Franchise as well as the centralized Pennsylvania Offices and Federal headquarters of the Black Collar Cartel and unregistered conglomerate complete. For good measure though I'm attaching this letter as Judicial Notice in the open and docketed Federal Case as well as Judicial notice in Lancaster County cases. It's important to continue to build the public record on the off chance judicial obstruction, conspiracy, treason, and sedition continues to haunt me at the Federal Level.

For clarity, any person listed above as a "Respondent" I consider attached to the unregistered and unincorporated cartel conglomerate through contract, law, or conspiracy.

I have also CCed a variety of "witnesses." I'm not accusing anyone labelled a witness of any crimes or wrongdoing... yet. You're all on notice that there are severe problems stemming from family law and if you stay silent, obstruct, or worse then you'll find yourself unenviably labelled "Respondent." Witnesses are folks who need to understand the gravity of the matters discussed herein and who have a fiduciary duty to respond to the size and scale of wrongdoing presented herein. They're witnesses today, but may become Respondents tomorrow if history repeats and they, like other fiduciaries before them, are derelict in their duty in the face of extensive criminal behavior and personal injury to me and similarly situated fathers.

For said witnesses and respondents who may be unfamiliar with me and my work; my name is Dr. Blair Reich, and I believe I have been wronged by the current defendants in my existing 42 U.S.C. § 1983 case in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania Federal District Court 25-CV-5331 and the more extensive list of Respondents listed herein. While the present complaint pending before the court considers a June 2025 Temporary Custody Order I am not totally satisfied with the current complaint and intend to amend it after establishing a substantial commercial default through the contents of this letter.

This letter serves as another form of notice that Respondents have wronged me and I know it. They know it. This resulted in irreparable harm, and has left me as a severely injured party.

Herein; I issue a notice of dishonor, reminder of commercial default, establish a lien, plan to document and certify said lien via UCC financing statements, and await the consequences of your perfected commercial default by Operation of Law. I'm also providing an extensive Affidavit of Probable cause so that everyone knows what crimes have been committed. Once the lien is perfected I have some options, one of which is to amend the Federal Complaint and immediately move for summary judgement after the impending commercial default imposed herein.

However; I believe there is a great path forward for America in general by teaming up with the US Treasury, providing them 25% of all proceeds (\$3.74 Trillion USD) of these matters, and I'll discuss that possibility more below. We can enrich the USA with trillions of dollars to be put to good use while smashing an insidious cartel lurking inside of Pennsylvania (and every county in every state with contracts signed by the governor from every state in an aggressive version of Phase II). That sounds excellent to me. Either way, here's hoping you'll settle quickly and

peacefully before costs escalate exponentially.

Actions and inactions taken by Respondents were outside their constitutional framework, and that leaves these respondents operating Ultra Vires. As we'll discuss, their weak claims that these matters contained herein pertain to a "domestic dispute," "custody matters," "divorce matters" or "support matters" will hold no water. We're dealing with extensive civil rights violations in the context of a Black Collar Cartel operating in plain sight. They'll try to wrap this into a Domestic Relations Exception for Federal Courts or Rooker-Feldman me, but again, the problem isn't that they gave my wife Tuesday custody when I wanted it. The problem isn't that I lost my support appeal. The problem is that they covertly omitted my Due Process and Equal Protection while overtly issuing orders that covertly deprived me of fundamental liberties. Of course I lost. It's a racket! So, what we're talking about is a civil rights issue wrapped inside a criminal matter, and that's why it's handled in Federal Court.

They'll say they have immunity, especially the judges, but good faith immunity for lawful swings of the gavel does not apply to bad faith criminal cartel activity. I'll show that the Federal Government has already **effectively** argued this point for me in another recent unrelated matter heading for trial. Judge Dugan walked an illegal immigrant out of the Courthouse to evade justice. My judges walked me through unlawful court proceedings to hold my children, property, income, peace, and sanity hostage and committed further crimes to evade accountability. Hopes and dreams of criminal officials relying on immunity for crimes will crumble before the magnitude and gravity of the claims herein.

They'll say I haven't stated a claim. That may work in corrupt courts, but my claims are precise and simple. They're playing possum when they say they don't understand, or it's too **convoluted**. They know exactly what they're doing. Plugging your fingers in your ears and dancing while saying "I don't understand what you're talking about" isn't going to work as a defense either.

One thing I've noticed is that in five years they've never said to me "I did not commit those offenses." Appreciating lawyers slithering their way out of things is like appreciating good Jazz music; jazz is not only the fine whines continuously blown out on the sax in a bittersweet melody. To truly understand Jazz you also have to appreciate and connect to the beats where the band or individual instruments don't play. The pregnant pauses and the patterns of silence indicate they're either hiding or alluding to something important. We don't just take them at their word. First they're deceptive people. But second, the truth is more often in the silence. Here that silence in face of these high crimes and litany of felonies is deafening.

As a result of faltering in the face of such a convoluted subject as Federal Supremacy your clients and respondents herein via their personal, official, and cartel capacities are commercially defaulted, have their immunity stripped, and personal liability with severe punitive factors are applied. Legal, commercial, and criminal reckoning is at hand. This is the personal, legal, financial, and criminal gravity of the consequences of their actions and no amount of judicial obstruction is going to interrupt this process. You'll have plenty of time to think about Federal

Supremacy as you sit by yourself or with some cellies to consider the magnitude of error you made when you treated the requirements of Federal Supremacy as optional or voluntary especially while being directly noticed and confronted regarding them. You may get a lethal dose of clarity as part of your participation.

To be clear; this letter is not regarding merely haggling over support, distribution schemes, or time of child custody. The matters contained herein describe five years of due process violations and criminal activity that create a vast array of damages stemming from irreparable harm which is exponentially increased by willfulness in the face of extensive notice regarding said harm. Is that too convoluted for you? Do you understand the claim?

Your clients, the Respondents to this letter (inclusive of more names than just the listed defendants in the existing case), have already been extensively notified of unlawful conduct. I've been doing criminal complaints, judicial notices, bar grievances, motions, motions to reconsider, extensive briefs, oral arguments, and meaningful measures to give them notice for years. I have been met consistently with obstruction, malfeasance, criminality, deprivation of constitutional rights, state created dangers, deliberate indifference, dereliction of duty, mockery, playing dumb, silence, returned mail, and all are happening under the banner of a cartel clothed in color of law effectuating a human trafficking, interstate money laundering and racketeering operation by way of daily acts of treason and sedition. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! This scheme ends.

Herein; either solo or with the support of the US Treasury I'm commercially defaulting the Cartel. I will then proceed to amend the complaint after the default has been perfected. It should simplify matters for us all quite a bit.

By taking this approach the difficult matters will already be settled by your silence, acquiescence, and acceptance and the only questions will be "when will you pay?" "how much will you pay?" and "how much work does this group collectively want to put in before surrendering in a complete and total rout to the most sophisticated pro se litigant they have ever encountered?"

One might even describe me as the Undisputed, Undefeated, Heavy Weight Champion of Pro Se and Sui Juris Litigation. Let's get ready to RUMBLE!

INVOCATION OF DIVINE PROTECTION: SCRIPTURES OF ASSURANCE AND STRENGTH

Psalm 91 (KJV)

He that dwelleth in the secret place of the most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty.

I will say of the Lord, He is my refuge and my fortress: my God; in him will I trust.

Surely he shall deliver thee from the snare of the fowler, and from the noisome pestilence.

He shall cover thee with his feathers, and under his wings shalt thou trust: his truth shall be thy shield and buckler.

Thou shalt not be afraid for the terror by night; nor for the arrow that flieth by day;

Nor for the pestilence that walketh in darkness; nor for the destruction that wasteth at noonday.

A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand; but it shall not come nigh thee.

Only with thine eyes shalt thou behold and see the reward of the wicked.

Because thou hast made the Lord, which is my refuge, even the most High, thy habitation;

There shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling.

For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways.

They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.

Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder: the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under feet.

Because he hath set his love upon me, therefore will I deliver him: I will set him on high, because he hath known my name.

He shall call upon me, and I will answer him: I will be with him in trouble; I will deliver him, and honour him.

With long life will I satisfy him, and shew him my salvation.

Psalm 23 (KJV)

The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want.

He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: he leadeth me beside the still waters.

He restoreth my soul: he leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake.

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me.

Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies: thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.

Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.

Joshua 1:9 (KJV)

Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed: for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest.

Isaiah 54:17 (KJV)

No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord, and their righteousness is of me, saith the Lord.

Psalm 46:1-3, 10-11 (KJV)

God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble.

Therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea;

Though the waters thereof roar and be troubled, though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof.

Be still, and know that I am God: I will be exalted among the heathen, I will be exalted in the earth.

The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge.

Deuteronomy 31:6 (KJV)

Be strong and of a good courage, fear not, nor be afraid of them: for the Lord thy God, he it is that doth go with thee; he will not fail thee, nor forsake thee.

Psalms 27:1-3 (KJV)

The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? the Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?

When the wicked, even mine enemies and my foes, came upon me to eat up my flesh, they stumbled and fell.

Though an host should encamp against me, my heart shall not fear: though war should rise against me, in this will I be confident.

Ephesians 6:10-18 (KJV) – The Whole Armour of God

Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might.

Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil.

For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.

Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand.

Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness;

And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace;

Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked.

And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God:

Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints.

INTRODUCTION

What you are likely going to be saddened by is that I'm actually an incredibly talented and sophisticated Pro Se litigant. I admittedly did not start that way, but as you'll see I have attained subject mastery. By training, I'm a PhD Chemist, but life has forced me to become a belligerent claimant at law.

The phrase "Belligerent Claimant" is most commonly associated with a 1947 federal district court ruling in *United States v. Johnson*, 76 F. Supp. 538 (M.D. Pa. 1947), where Judge James Alger Fee used it in the context of Fifth Amendment protections against self-incrimination. The direct quote from that opinion is:

"The privilege against self-incrimination is neither accorded to the passive resistant, nor the person who is ignorant of his rights, nor to one indifferent thereto. **It is a fighting clause. Its benefits can be retained only by sustained combat.** It cannot be claimed by attorney or solicitor. **It is valid only when insisted upon by a belligerent claimant in person.** The one who is persuaded by honeyed words or moral suasion to testify or produce documents rather than make a last ditch stand, simply loses the protection. Once he testifies to part, he has waived his right and must on cross examination or otherwise, testify as to the whole transaction. He must refuse to answer or produce, and test the matter in contempt proceedings, or by habeas corpus."

I've been involved in a high conflict divorce for five years. It's the legal equivalent of a full contact professional sport. I present myself there. The entire bench of the Lancaster Court of Common Pleas has recused themselves, and I'm mostly focused on getting Justice for unlawful and unconstitutional orders and actions. For five straight years I've been training and engaging in sustained combat with an entire Bench and now multiple Senior Judges while accusing the Chief Justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. If law were a martial art I'd have a decorated Black Belt.

Separately, I have been sued in three separate Federal Lawsuits as owner and operator of a business, and I won all three. So, I just want to be clear that I have five years of state and federal experience under my belt.

More recently, I've developed multiple systems that are highly efficient at keeping unlawful actors at bay and punishing them for their unlawful actions. You can find the various stories, methods, and practice on a website I operate called blackcollarcartel.com. You can find an extensive Affidavit of Probable Cause that I have used to accuse the Lancaster County Judiciary and associated DRS of a sophisticated racketeering and human trafficking operation effectuated by daily doses of treason. That's covered in the book "Black Collar Crime Spree." It's part of the story herein and relevant to this day. So, if you want additional clarity on my rights and Black Collar Crimes this is your go to destination.

Next, I wrote a book entitled Guerilla Lawfare. This one walks through methods of various forms of professional complaints to deter people from negative legal interactions with me. You can find various forms of judicial complaints, bar grievances, and professional complaints attached herein. Admittedly, individual Bar Grievances don't always move the dial, but one every month for several months is usually enough to make your insurance carrier question what's happening and if they want to continue offering legal coverage.

After that, I wrote a book entitled "LEX-CIVIX: The Frameworks of Law." Talented high powered corporate attorneys often reference more than one piece of the law at a time. I however operate simultaneously in Federal and State law across Constitutional Considerations, Statutory Code, Regulations, Case Law, and Court Rules. Today I'm showing my mastery of the Commercial Code to bring about Commercial Default and hasten these matters considerably. You've likely never seen anything like this as I'm a co-inventor of the process and believe that it represents the apex of law as I wield the full Biblical, federal, state, and commercial vertical stack of legal frameworks in every swing I take. Getting hit with this will literally rewrite your brain and expand your concept of law. Convolutions deconvoluted in real time.

I'm publishing this Affidavit as a stand alone book entitled "Convuluted Federal Supremacy" and I'll be incorporating it into a later book entitled "Belligerent Claimant" where I teach how to go on offense and especially how to fight bad actors in Government.

I would also note that as a PhD Chemist I have a rather intense curiosity. I'm very much interested in the legal framework by which you're operating your commercial legal structure as well as the financial impact that it bears. This curiosity is going to require a substantial number of hours by cartel employees and a team of legal professionals. You'll see that in this letter as I again request FOIA access to important documentation regarding you, your role, your oath, your bond, your employment, your contracts, and documents leading to exposing the broad operations of your cartel.

You'll notice one thing I don't say is that "I'm an attorney." I'm no Bar Card. I am not part of the club. I'm not part of the profession. I don't have professional courtesy. I don't have to meet you at the bar after work. I'm not getting invited to Christmas parties. I'm not here to bow and curtsy to any judge. Christ is my King, and I'm too faithful to bend the knee to anyone else.

The rest of you appear to be wholly wicked, corrupt, cruel, and guilty of unfathomable amounts of crime. I'm not here to play games with you. I'm here to cause as much mental, physical, financial, and legal pain as possible until you Let Go and stop harming me and my family and those similarly situated. I have one Biblically required pause baked in wherein I feel obligated to give you a final chance to cure, but beyond that expect no quarter. You've had every chance to repent, cure, and alter course. Most of you have one way out left and the way forward is admittedly a tight fit in a keyhole sized exit before the effects of Convuluted Federal Supremacy head your way with seismic impact.

In the grand scheme of things there are people that you can push around, and there are people you should steer clear of. I want to be upfront with you that I'm one of the latter and I'm going to bring an ungodly amount of pain and financial gravity to bear as the consequences of your actions. I will push and pursue these matters almost as if I've taken it rather personally when you've unlawfully, unconstitutionally, unethically, deliberately, and oppressively held my property, income, safety, freedom, sanity, health, and my children hostage for five years.

You now have a Master of Law arisen by non-stop sustained barbaric legal combat pursuing the unrepentant until his last breath. He comes with Divine Authority, your pre-documented consent, extensive evidence of wrongdoing and acceptance of his terms, and his next approach is colored by a righteous fury for the insane amount of harm you've caused him and those similarly situated. I don't envy you. This is going to hurt and it will stain your bloodline for generations over eons.

BIBLICAL AUTHORITY, ETERNAL LAW, AND THE WRATH OF THE ALMIGHTY: A FINAL WARNING TO WRONGDOERS AND CORRUPT JUDGES

In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, who came to seek and to save that which was lost (Luke 19:10), I address you, ye serpents and scorpions, under the divine authority granted unto me: "Behold, I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy: and nothing shall by any means hurt you" (Luke 10:19). Thus, I invoke this holy mandate to trample underfoot the wickedness you have wrought against me through theft, deceit, and fraud—sins condemned by the eternal Word of God. Hear ye, ye serpents in robes and vipers in the guise of authority, who sit in judgment seats yet pervert justice for gain, who steal children from their fathers, kidnap the innocent under color of law, traffic in human souls through interstate Title IV-D schemes, launder the fruits of extortion as "child support," and deprive men of their God-given rights and Sacred parental duties! The Lord God hath spoken, and His word is a fire that consumeth the wicked. Ye who break His commandments shall not escape His vengeance, for the Almighty is not mocked, as it is written:

"Thou shalt not steal" (Exodus 20:15)—yet ye plunder families, seizing wages and property under false pretenses, robbing fathers of their children and their substance, turning the sanctuary of the home into a den of thieves and vipers.

"Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour" (Exodus 20:16)—yet ye swear lies in your courts, fabricating debts and delinquencies, testifying falsely to separate father from child, weaving webs of deceit to enrich your coffers with federal blood money.

"Ye shall not steal, neither deal falsely, neither lie one to another" (Leviticus 19:11)—yet ye deal falsely every day, lying to the poor and afflicted, stealing liberty and heritage, oppressing fathers, harming children and the broken for profit, defiling the land with your abominations.

And woe unto you who engage in manstealing—the most heinous theft of all, kidnapping the soul and body of the innocent! As it is written, "And he that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death" (Exodus 21:16). Ye who traffic in children, selling them for interstate Title IV-D incentives, holding them as hostages in your corrupt system—hearken to the judgment: death is decreed upon the manstealer, and the Lord executeth His sentence without mercy. For mercy to savage wolves spares not the flock (Acts 20:29).

The wages of sin is death (Romans 6:23), and ye have sown the wind; now comes the storms of your own sins and failures. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die" (Ezekiel 18:4)—your souls hang in the balance, for ye have despised the Lord's statutes and broken His covenant. Terror, consumption, and sorrow of heart shall be appointed over you (Leviticus 26:16), curses shall

overtake you (Deuteronomy 28:15), and no weapon formed against the righteous shall prosper, but every tongue rising against them in judgment shall be condemned (Isaiah 54:17).

Repent, ye workers of iniquity, the wrath of God falls nigh upon you like fire from heaven. The Lord is slow to anger, but His fury upon the unrepentant is terrible: everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels (Matthew 25:41), where the wicked shall go away into eternal punishment. The hour is late; the Judge of all the Earth stands ready to execute righteousness.

As Above So Below

I shared Divine Law above and note it is fundamental to the Earthly world below. The Bible stands as a foundational pillar of American jurisprudence, as affirmed by the United States Congress in Public Law 97-280, which recognizes the Bible's unique contribution in shaping the United States as a distinctive and Blessed nation. In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, this truth is enshrined in case law, where the Supreme Court in *Updegraph v. Commonwealth* (1824) declared that "Christianity, general Christianity, is and always has been a part of the common law of Pennsylvania."

Armed with this Sacred and Legal Authority, I, Dr. Blair Reich, am Uriel, winged and crowned Archangel of Divine Love and Light, Doctor of Science, Master of Law, and Earthly Bound. I have an Ordained mission of disinfecting your corrupt disease ridden cult and cartel masquerading under the pierced veneer of Government Office. I'm here to answer the Prayers of similarly situated Fathers you have trapped in convoluted schemes of suffering and slavery. Justice is at hand. The Sword of Damocleas is above your head and I wield an executioner's grip.

Let my presence assure you that Divine Judgement has already been declared. You might think we're gearing up, but we're actually winding down.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!

You have sinned, God has spoken, and now I come with a mandate of Heavenly Radiance that will appear terrifying to you. Your dreams are mine. Your peace is mine. Your waking hours are mine. You are mine until repentance, retribution, and Divine Justice has been restored and the wicked and the wrongdoers are punished for their sins. We'll see what parts of you are still recognizable by then.

I'm not here solely/Souly to trample you personally. I'm here to cleanse a Den of Robbers, restore the Court's equitable duty as a "House of Prayer," to protect what's mine, and to stop you from any more irreparable harm resulting from your sins, crimes, wrongdoing, and wickedness. Some of you think your inaction will protect you, but dereliction of duty will provide nil comfort in the coming days and your coming darkness.

Matthew 21:12-13

"Jesus entered the temple courts and drove out all who were buying and selling there. He overturned the tables of the money changers and the benches of those selling doves. 'It is written,' he said to them, 'My house will be called a house of prayer,' but you are making it 'a den of robbers.'"

Mark 11:15-17

"On reaching Jerusalem, Jesus entered the temple courts and began driving out those who were buying and selling there. He overturned the tables of the money changers and the benches of those selling doves, and would not allow anyone to carry merchandise through the temple courts. And as he taught them, he said, 'Is it not written: My house will be called a house of prayer for all nations'? But you have made it 'a den of robbers.'"

Luke 19:45-46

"When Jesus entered the temple courts, he began to drive out those who were selling. 'It is written,' he said to them, 'My house will be a house of prayer'; but you have made it 'a den of robbers.'"

John 2:13-16

"When it was almost time for the Jewish Passover, Jesus went up to Jerusalem. In the temple courts he found people selling cattle, sheep and doves, and others sitting at tables exchanging money. So he made a whip out of cords, and drove all from the temple courts, both sheep and cattle; he scattered the coins of the money changers and overturned their tables. To those who sold doves he said, 'Get these out of here! Stop turning my Father's house into a market!'"

Herein I flip these tables in the modern Sadducean Judicial Temple and woe and eternal damnation onto thee who stands in my way.

AFFIDAVIT OF FACT AND TRUTH

I, Dr. Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich, of sound mind and lawful age, do hereby declare and affirm the following facts to be true, correct, and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief, under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of the United States of America and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I have voluntarily undergone a psychological evaluation in 2021 and been found fit to stand trial. I state the following willfully, voluntarily, honestly, and ethically.

The Affidavit is large and so it's broken into the following parts-

OUTLINE

- I. BRIEF HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF A 20-YEAR MARRIAGE**
- II. RELEVANT RECENT TIMELINE OF A HIGH CONFLICT DIVORCE**
- III. PROTECTION FROM ABUSE (PFA)**
- IV. FAMILY LAW AT THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA**
 - A. JUDGE HACKMAN ERA CUSTODY (October 2020- May 2024)
 - B. HACKMAN ER SUPPORT
 - C. HACKMAN ERA DIVORCE
 - D. RETIRED SENIOR JUDGE WILLIAM P MAHON ERA CUSTODY (May 2024 to the present)
 - E. RETIRED SENIOR JUDGE WILLIAM P MAHON ERA SUPPORT
 - F. RETIRED SENIOR JUDGE WILLIAM P MAHON ERA DIVORCE
- V. CIVIL RIGHTS MATTERS**
 - A. HABEAS CORPUS AT THE LANCASTER CCP
 - B. 42 USC 1983 (first unamended complaint) IN FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT

DETAILED

I. BRIEF (2 PAGE) HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF A 20-YEAR MARRIAGE

The following historical background is for reference. No claims of damage or crime of any sort originate in the Background period, but it does provide useful context.

- C. Blair Reich ("Husband") and Alene Reich ("Wife"), collectively referred to as "the Couple," first met at a college dance party on September 9, 1999.
- D. Husband was a year ahead in college, graduated in 3 years, and proceeded to get a Doctorate in Chemistry from Texas A&M University.
- E. Wife finished her degree in 3 years, moved to Texas, and completed her own post-graduate degree with a Masters in Architecture also from Texas A&M.

- F. The Couple briefly left Texas to get married on August 3, 2002, in Edgecomb, Maine.
- G. They travelled to various parts of America following their graduation as part of Husband's work requirements.
- H. They moved to Massachusetts when Husband's mother contracted Cancer.
- I. While in Massachusetts (approximately 2007-2018) they produced three healthy (IMR, EJR, and JFR) biological minor children born of the marriage, with current ages ranging from teenager to elementary school scholar (all are under the age of majority).
- J. Husband asserts that, upon marriage, the Couple effectively entered into a premarital agreement manifested as a consensually co-authored contract, which was incorporated into their wedding ceremony as the base of the ceremony and mutual pledge and oath of support. This ceremony deviated from traditional formats, as the Parties authored, directed, and performed it themselves.
 - 1. The agreement focused on mutual support of the other as neither Husband nor Wife had any meaningful property save for student loans.
- K. In the initial years of the marriage, Husband acknowledges that the relationship was at times tumultuous, and he openly admits he bears primary responsibility for the marital difficulties during the first 12 years.
- L. Husband acknowledges and concedes that he experienced alcohol-induced bipolar disorder from approximately 2006 until his spontaneous recovery on October 19, 2015 and notes he has been alcohol free since then.
- M. Husband is not blameless and he stipulates to an unfair eviction of Wife and recently born children who were sent to her Mother's house near Baltimore Maryland for several months with later reconciliation.
 - 1. This fact gives context to some of the wrongs suffered by Wife at the hands of Husband and some of the abnormally large amounts of spite and anger directed his way.
- N. The marriage was quite rocky and two separate instances in Massachusetts stand out where Wife unilaterally took the children without Husband's consent.
 - 1. No police reports were filed.
 - 2. No court action was taken.
 - 3. Voluntary reconciliation occurred afterward.
 - 4. No legal matter or claim is presented from this fact,
 - 5. but this fact gives context as to why Husband escalated quickly in the instant matters that took place in Pennsylvania.
 - a) To him, the first abduction that took place in Pennsylvania was actually the third such abduction in the marriage.
- O. At the time of Husband's spontaneous recovery in 2015 Wife was actively declaring she wanted a divorce and was navigating towards it.
- P. Following Husband's spontaneous recovery, the Parties voluntarily reconciled (marking something like the 4th or 5th time the Couple had separated and reconciled) and they made a concerted effort to restore the marital relationship.
- Q. 2018 was a particularly significant year.

1. The Couple became pregnant
 2. Husband started a materially significant blockchain based business
 3. The private Waldorf school where the marital children went closed down
- R. A brief period of harmony in 2018 resulted in an unplanned pregnancy in February 2018.
- S. However; once Wife realized she was pregnant again she unequivocally withdrew her "love and support" as outlined in the privately authored marital agreement.
- T. Wife informed Husband that she was dissatisfied with him being the father of the expected child and subsequently clarified that she held the same sentiment regarding their other children.
1. Upon realizing she was pregnant with JFR, Wife expressed to Husband she was upset he was the Father of their forthcoming son.
 2. Wife clarified that she was upset that not only was he the Father of the forthcoming son, but also clarified that she was upset he was the Father of the two older daughters as well.
 3. As a result Husband removed his wedding band, spoke the words verbatim "I no longer consent to this marriage under these terms."
 4. Husband proceeded to give her time and space to reconsider and to cure her breach of their private marital agreement rather than immediately nuking a 15 year marriage.
 5. She did not reconsider.
 6. She did not cure.
 7. This moment in February/March of 2018 is the demarcation where reconciliation no longer happens.
- U. Also in 2018 Husband started a private cryptocurrency based video game business and by the end of the year voluntarily quit working in edtech sales to focus on his blockchain startup.
- V. Unrelated to any action of the Couple, the private Waldorf school attended by the children closed due to a lack of students necessary to continue funding the operation.
- W. Wife delivers JFR in December of 2018, a giant sized baby weighing nearly 12 lbs with various health consequences resulting from birthing this baby behemoth.
- X. Despite marital difficulties the Couple planned and executed a move to Mount Joy, Pennsylvania.
- Y. This move satisfied key criteria for the family-
1. Husband's business partner was located near Philadelphia and this move would make business communication easier.
 2. Wife's family is from Maryland and this move would make extended family closer (Husband's mother had recently passed so his connection and family in Massachusetts was no longer an issue)
 3. There existed a Waldorf school, hand picked by Wife, that would serve as a base of education for the children.

- Z. Initially, the Parties proceeded toward divorce in a manner that, while tense, remained constructive, in good faith, and towards a purpose of landing the family in a good new spot and honoring a marriage spanning ~20 years.
- AA. The Parties purchased a house in Mount Joy, Pennsylvania and moved in this home over August and September of 2019.

2. DETAILED RELEVANT RECENT TIMELINE OF A HIGH CONFLICT DIVORCE

The rocky yet determined Couple intended to get their children settled and move into their separate lives. This process was going fairly smoothly until Wife contracted with her Attorney Wendy Chan.

Wendy Chan is an experienced attorney who has independently figured out, like many other attorneys, that family law is a rigged game operated by a cartel. As a consequence Wendy has become well adapted to her environment by acting exclusively with excessive aggression. She demonstrates limited skill in the law, but that's all that's required as her purpose is to serve up demands to the Court so they have something to work with to enforce unconstitutionally oppressive support orders, unconstitutionally asymmetric custody orders, and use divorce as a means to keep holding litigants in family law as long as possible. She doesn't need skill or legal knowledge. She just needs to understand the game is rigged, she just has to lob something family-law-esque in front of the judges, and she can trust they'll use whatever has been presented to them to fleece the breadwinner (almost always the father) of as much money as possible.

We're now at this point the story goes from tense to conflicted and the first bad faith strike happens in June of 2020 when Wife steals \$30,000 from Husband. This money was already committed for use to purchase a separate "bachelor pad" in Columbia, Pennsylvania forcing the liquidation of cryptocurrency assets to enable the purchase. Husband was purchasing this property with friends as a business venture, and pivoted early on to realize he could move out of the house and be the first tenant.

Husband Moves out in August/September. Wife serves Divorce papers in October. The Couple is attempting a lot of real estate activity. They intend to physically separate in a more permanent way. Wife and Husband to sell the marital home. Husband to sell the temporary Bachelor pad. Wife to buy a house in Marietta Pennsylvania and Husband to buy a different house on Cherry Street in Columbia Pennsylvania. Chaos ensues as the four separate real estate transactions come together all at once.

Relatively Low Conflict - There is a theft of \$30k, but otherwise the Couple is able to tensely navigate constructively.

- a. **June 2020:** Husband announced his intent to move out of the marital home. On June 16, Husband emailed with eldest child IMR regarding summer courses. On June 24, under counsel's guidance, Wife withdrew \$30,000 from Husband's separate account, claiming it as "marital property"; Husband viewed this as felony theft. By month's end, Wife led a family discussion informing the children of the impending divorce.
- b. **July 2020:** Husband purchased and spent a month cleaning a property on 4th Street in Columbia. On July 24, Wife forwarded a moving quote to Husband. On July 30, Wife texted an offer to provide tacos for the movers assisting Husband's relocation (tense but functional relationship).
- c. **August 2020:** On August 12, Husband moved into the Columbia house. The Parties adopted a flexible custody arrangement for the summer, allowing children to stay where they preferred with frequent visits and tradeoffs; middle child EJР resided primarily with Husband, while IMR and infant JFR stayed with Wife. Cooperative exchanges included: August 2, Husband texting Wife for a children's app password; August 3, Wife visiting the Columbia house to prepare dinner; August 5, texts about housewares; August 6, Wife coordinating child pickup; August 7, Husband sharing a photo of a child at the new home; August 8, child-related incident shared via text; August 9, family outing to a hotel pool (later referenced in Wife's PFA and custody filings); August 12, Husband sharing images of a child's "No Dads" sign and closet organization, with Wife responding supportively; August 14, joint email to school regarding children's enrollment amid divorce, noting remote learning challenges; August 15, family kite-flying field trip and texts about children's activities and behavior; August 17, Wife dropping off groceries; August 18, Husband sharing a humorous house rule "no oven use while wearing roller skates"; August 21, Wife agreeing to a custody swap for Husband's visit with business partner; August 22, Husband sharing renovation photos; August 24, child texting Wife from Husband's phone and Husband sharing baking photos; August 25, discussion of a bounced check; August 28, Wife requesting unexpected child pickup for a school meeting, which Husband approved; August 29, texts on COVID precautions; August 31, Husband sharing photos of children's play.
- d. **September 2020:** By mutual consent, the Parties formed a private custody agreement to facilitate school activities. Cooperative interactions continued: September 2, Wife thanking Husband for delivering spring water and texts about child discipline and shopping; September 4, family visit to another homestead; September 6, Wife organizing an internet-free day and inviting Husband to join; September 9, texts about school tuition where in Wife requests payment amid lingering tension from the \$30,000 episode; September 15, Wife requesting vehicle registration update; September 16, Wife sharing humorous child anecdotes; September 18, Wife inviting Husband for birthday cake with children; September 23, texts on child logistics, horseback riding, and minor illnesses, with Wife sharing photos and noting a child's preference to stay with Husband; September 24, Wife's surprise visit during child custody time; September 27,

family pumpkin picking; September 29, Wife inviting Husband and children for pizza, leading to lighthearted family discussion. During this month, a Praecipe for Divorce via mutual consent or irreconcilable differences was filed by Wife.

- e. **October 2020:** Cooperation persisted initially: October 1, Wife coordinating child schedules and sharing school photos; October 4, Wife sending shoe purchase options for evaluation; October 7, Husband inviting Wife to stay for dinner during pickup; October 8, Wife providing contact for a family playdate at Husband's request; October 11, Wife picking up a child for dinner with her mother; October 12, Husband delivering provisions for a sick child; October 17, Wife inviting Husband for cake to celebrate his "rebirthday" amid family visits; October 19, Husband watching children for Wife's medical appointment; October 21, Husband sharing humorous text about a gift; October 22, Wife requesting extra time with a child for her social plans, which Husband granted; October 23, Wife attempting to engage a child with incentives amid relational strains; October 24, Wife sharing news of her sister's brain tumor and sending photos of potential purchases for children; October 27, child requesting to switch homes; October 30, Husband texted Wife upon being served divorce papers. The Praecipe for Divorce was reinstated, marking service and the shift to formal, high-conflict proceedings.
- f. **November 2020:** On November 5, Husband contacted mlfamilylawcenter.com for mediation and informed Wife of potential high costs, estimating \$50,000 or more based on his father's experience. On November 10, in a mediation thread, Parties discussed the date of separation; Wife's counsel proposed July 2020 (Husband's move-out), but Husband advocated for an earlier date. On November 11, Husband requested Wife withdraw the lawsuit for private settlement. Cooperative family interactions included: November 5, Husband texting about a playdate with Kathryn Pearce and her daughter; November 7, Wife attempting to arrange a playdate for Evie; November 10, Husband shopping with daughters; November 11, Husband texting about children's needs; November 14, formal text on child drop-off; November 17, texts on child health, discipline, divorce costs, and date of separation, with Wife noting no-fault grounds and Husband emphasizing mutual terms; November 18, Husband sharing a fun video of children playing; November 24, Husband preparing an initial asset inventory and settlement offer (\$320,342 to Wife, -\$62,654 to Husband), plus Wife requesting child coverage; November 27, Husband taking son to park and playing with daughter; November 28, Husband assisting with Wife's poison ivy; November 29, texts on setting up child's online play; November 30, Wife's counsel emailing aggressively for responses, prompting Husband to text Wife for clarification (Wife confirmed approval).
- g. **December 2020:** Husband began dating his paramour. On December 2, Wife rejected Husband's November 24 offer but suggested pausing the divorce; Husband declined. Cooperative exchanges included: December 4, Wife getting a cat for Evie, with Husband texting an emotional story of bonding with her; December 5, Husband providing a \$7,500 check for Wife's post-JFR-birth surgery (despite opposition), followed by a park outing and texts on "emotional

labor," including article shares and discussions of mutual burdens; December 7, Husband texting gratitude and support; December 8, Husband praising Wife's resilience, with texts on acknowledgment of past strains; December 9, texts on child support; December 12, Husband thanking Wife for a difficult walk and talk; December 13, Husband sharing bouldering photos; December 15, Husband thanking Wife for settlement spreadsheets; December 17, child-related home damage discussed; December 18, Wife forwarding old messages from Husband's 2015 episode; December 20, family sledding; December 22, Wife touring Husband's potential property; December 24, Wife thanking Husband for visiting; December 25, Wife inviting Husband for Christmas; December 27, Wife creating a financial spreadsheet, with Husband responding; December 28, texts on COVID concerns, Husband admits his new relationship and dating to middle child EJR when prodded after seeing them on a walk, issuing \$8,000 in relief checks, and discussing ballet, amid relational tensions.

- h. **January 2021:** Husband offered \$2.5 million over five years for settlement. On January 10, Husband's paramour drafted a joint email to child's teacher about home sale and family dynamics, with all Parties approving positively. On January 10, Husband initiated a "Hard limits and safety rules" thread, upset over Wife dating a teacher, requesting tuition reimbursement changes. On January 11, joint email sent to teacher. On January 13, Husband's business hacked, deferring child discussions; logistics arranged for child moves. On January 18, paramour emailed a proposed custody schedule based on current practices. Cooperative and tense interactions included: January 1, Wife texting about child's rage, Husband assisting; January 4, texts on finances and relationships; January 5, family gathering praised by Husband; January 6, Husband watching kids for Wife's inspection; January 8, Husband texting support and volunteering for packing; January 9 and 12, Husband helping pack and watch kids; January 14, Husband agreeing to supervise school kids; January 15, coordinating logistics; January 18, Wife inviting Husband upstairs for long talk; January 19, humorous texts; January 21, Wife offering extra child time, Husband noting scheduling needs, plus group hangout logistics; January 22, spats over feelings and boundaries; January 24, family Zoom attended by all; January 27-28, spats over money and taxes, resolved with payment and thanks; January 28, discussing Husband's hotel/massage gift to Wife.
- i. **February 2021:** On February 6, emails indicated ongoing mediation exploration. Cooperative exchanges turned tense: February 2, texts on flooring; February 3, Husband sharing child nap and store details; February 4, Wife joining for dinner after countertop decisions; February 5, home leak discussed; February 6, Husband requesting financial details, Wife staying overnight at Husband's with kids; February 7-8, child logistics and overnight stays; February 9, Husband watching kids while Wife house paints; February 10, Husband ordering and paying for house paint.

Moderate Conflict- The Couple, especially prodded by Wendy Chan, fights extensively around multiple simultaneously real estate deals to help physically separate the family.

- j. **February 2021:** On February 11, Wife coordinated remodeling efforts for the marital home at 319 Locust Lane in preparation for sale. On February 12, Wife confirmed a verbal plan for Husband to transfer funds for school tuition, signed the contract, and took all children to allow Husband and his paramour a Valentine's Day together. On February 15, brief texts on children's Zoom calls. On February 16, Husband offered to cover Wife's mortgage and construction costs via a loan, which Wife initially agreed to in writing but later rescinded; Husband expressed upset over tuition payments indirectly supporting Wife's boyfriend. On February 17, Wife brought children to Husband for two days; marital inventory submitted to mediator. On February 18, texts on work logistics. On February 19, mediator canceled consultation, deeming Parties unfit for mediation. On February 22, intense texts resolved amicably, but include a discussion of Wife **threatening to take the kids again if Husband does not purchase her house outright** (rather than with her holding a mortgage or debt). On February 24-25, Wife handled child pickups and drop-offs, including paramour's daughter.
- k. **House Sale and Financial Disputes (February 10-25, 2021):** Tensions peaked over the sale of the marital home at 319 Locust Lane (proceeds ~\$294,000 after fees) and purchases of new homes (Wife's at 128-130 E. Market St., Marietta; Husband's at 227 Cherry St., Columbia). In email threads "Seller Net @ \$310k" and "Fwd: Reich - 128-130 Market Street," realtor Jeremy Crouse provided details. Wife proposed distributions; Husband countered, seeking reimbursement for expenses and rejecting labor claims, emphasizing past financial support. Wife's counsel, Wendy Chan, accused Husband of blackmail and bullying, threatening asset freezes, non-dissipation petitions, and discovery demands. Husband offered documents for 50:50 proceeds split and joint custody; Chan refused, demanding termination of contracts. Realtor urged resolution amid personal loss; stand-in Tina Reese outlined breach consequences (~\$20-30k). Wife affirmed readiness to proceed with waivers; Husband consented to using Locust proceeds for Marietta purchase (\$204,666.52). On February 25, home sold; Wife received majority proceeds (~\$225,000), purchasing Marietta outright; Husband received minority (~\$66,000), securing a 95% mortgage for Cherry St. Affidavits signed counting distributions toward equitable distribution; spousal waivers executed. In a separate "Financial Options" thread, Husband proposed alternative distributions, ignored by Wife. On February 12, Wife texted shifting terms; Husband responded detailing risks and intent for 50:50 split until full settlement.
- l. **March 2021:** On March 2, Wife filed complaint for support. On March 8, Wife emailed school opposing paramour's attendance at parent-teacher meetings. On March 12, Husband requested bill cancellation; Wife brought children for weekend stay. On March 15, Wife responsible for school payments with Husband

reimbursement. On March 18-19, in "Transitions" thread, Husband requested custody adjustments at children's request (e.g., block schedule for eldest); Wife proposed reduced time (weekdays with her, weekends with him). Husband rejected, proposing 84-hour weekly split. On March 19, Wife filed motion to compel discovery in divorce. On March 20, Husband and paramour hosted successful birthday party for eldest child. On March 26, Husband emailed about middle child's distress from Wife's "age-inappropriate" divorce discussions (e.g., accusing Husband of theft); requested cessation and new schedule. Husband's discovery response letter rejected demands, citing breached marital contract.

High Conflict- After Husband buys Wife a house, in part to calm her enough so that she won't abduct the kids, she turns around and abducts the kids. She papers over it with a Petition for Protection from Abuse.

- m. **March 28, 2021:** In the "3/28 Handoff" email thread, Wife picked up the children on an off-schedule day and stated she received Husband's prior email, would address it that week, but planned no schedule changes ahead of the April 7 conference, acknowledging the current arrangement worked poorly. Husband escalated, refusing the hearing (to preserve rights), accusing Wife of kidnapping for exceeding 84 hours weekly, threatening state/federal criminal complaints against Wife and her counsel (including bar grievance and mail fraud), demanding 50% parenting time with block scheduling per children's wishes, issuing a cease-and-desist, and proposing two schedule options or a meeting via his calendar.
- n. **March 29, 2021:** Husband emailed Wife's counsel a cease-and-desist, bar grievance notice, mail fraud complaint, substantial claim, and filed affidavits.
- o. **March 31, 2021:** On a day Husband was scheduled to pick up children from school per private agreement, Wife arrived early, removed them, and refused to share physical custody. Husband contacted school administration about the abduction and spoke with Columbia Police, who advised private agreements were unenforceable without a court order. In the "I'm Concerned" email thread initiated by Wife, she expressed worries about Husband's mental health since December 2020, citing patterns from past episodes (e.g., 2015 psychotic break, paranoia, drug interactions), compartmentalization of identities ("Aggroed" vs. "Jesse" ongoing since 2016), and risks to children; she withheld them pending evaluation. Husband responded by reporting it as kidnapping, rejecting consent to removal from school or separation, accusing retaliation for his filings, and urging correction for children's sake. On April 2, Wife replied, citing Husband's filings and "kidnapping" claims as evidence of lost reality touch, patterns of instability, and threats; demanded psychological check-in before resuming schedule. Husband countered, defending filings as necessary responses to her suit, clarifying "kidnapping" as common usage, questioning Wife's stability (antidepressants, erratic actions, gaslighting children), noting his voluntary preemptive evaluation in expectation of her claims of mental health to justify

taking the kids for otherwise unrelated reasons, demanding her evaluation, and proposing Monday meeting for custody agreement; offered police welfare checks if concerned.

- p. **April 1, 2021:** Husband scheduled psychological evaluation voluntarily, anticipating Wife's claims. Met with school teachers/administrators in "Parent Teacher Meetings" email/thread to detail abduction urgency.
- q. **April 2, 2021:** Husband emailed Wife "How Long Will You Hold Them?" inquiring about abduction duration; no response. School responded requiring custody agreement for continued enrollment. In "Visitation" thread, Husband informed Wife of discussion with Susquehanna Regional Police detective, asserted right to see children, and requested meeting time; no response. Private School informed of the parental abduction; states the children may not return to school until a Custody plan is presented.
- r. **April 5, 2021:** Unbeknownst to Husband, Wife filed and was granted a PFA for herself (not children), complicating contact despite Husband's rights to reach children via Wife. This was unexpected, as Wife had written less than a week prior, "I am not personally afraid of you." Coincidentally, in "Visit Tonight" email thread, Husband notified intent to visit children; interaction at Wife's East Market Street door lasted ~3 minutes—Wife directed children upstairs, denied access, informed Husband of PFA, and requested he leave; Husband complied voluntarily. Wife called police, resulting in harassment ticket.
- s. **April 7, 2021:** First support hearing; Husband offered peaceful resistance.
- t. **April 13, 2021:** Email logistics discussion on failed FaceTime call.
- u. **April 14, 2021:** Middle child called Husband crying, stating intent to confront Wife. Wife proposed supervised visits via "Child First Family Services" in email; Husband did not respond.
- v. **April 15, 2021:** Middle child absent from school without notice to Husband; he requested Susquehanna Regional Police wellness check.
- w. **April 16, 2021:** Judge Stedman appointed, replacing Spahn Jr., due to Husband's docket filings.
- x. **April 27, 2021:** PFA hearing; Husband submitted voluntary psychological evaluation by Dr. Gransee, affirming fitness and no illness. Wife requested continuance for witnesses; granted to May 25.
- y. **April 28, 2021:** Husband filed for custody and PFA against Wife (self only).
- z. **May 5, 2021:** Hearing ordered for June 1 on document production.
- aa. **May 11, 2021:** Harassment charges dismissed by Mount Joy Magistrate: "Though I do not believe it was wise to visit Ms. Reich, this does not rise to the level of harassment."
- bb. **May 12, 2021:** Husband filed for de novo support trial.
- cc. **May 14, 2021:** De novo support hearing scheduled for June 14.
- dd. **May 25, 2021:** Wife's PFA dismissed; Husband's PFA petition dismissed. Husband informed school of dismissal and proposed simple 50:50 custody agreement, reverting to private agreement. Wife ignored, continuing to withhold children (Husband's termed second abduction). In "Let's Change Course—Family

Time This Weekend" email, Husband noted PFA/harassment victories, refuted mental illness claims, highlighted children's pre-abduction stability vs. current trauma from Wife's actions (e.g., lies, separations), and proposed park visit for transition; urged reversal for children's sake.

- ee. **May 26, 2021:** Husband requested child visit; no response from Wife. Wife continued Waldorf school enrollment.
- ff. **May 28, 2021:** In "Kiddos (2)" thread, Husband requested child handover at Sheetz that evening, return Sunday; Wife responded, "You are a pro se litigant contacting me directly about a matter coming before the court next week. Please communicate with my attorney." In effect, despite no legal authority to hold to the kids, and despite having a private agreement that the Couple defaulted back to after the dismissal of the PFA Order she unilaterally abducted the kids AGAIN. In "Counseling" thread, Wife introduced children's counselor Bruce Eyer; Husband requested details, contact, and full list of children's medical professionals.

3. DETAILED PROTECTION FROM ABUSE (PFA)

Now we move away from the narrative of life with Wife, and instead focus on the monumental, seismic, and earth-shattering displays of Due Process Failure and Violation by way of Lancaster County, Lancaster CCP, and related Lancaster DRS with support from the Attorney General Heather Adams by way of dereliction of duty.

In case you're just skimming: In the previous section Wife threatened to take my kids in February unless I bought her a house free and clear of debt using the proceeds of the marital home. I bought her the house, and she abducted them anyway. I told the school that we're in a race to the bottom and they responded by saying the children could not attend unless a custody order was in place. I wrote a bland custody order. Wife filed a false report via Petition for Protection from Abuse, which as you'll see is unlawfully granted.

Protection from Abuse (PFA) Proceedings

1. **April 5, 2021:** Wife filed a Protection from Abuse (PFA) petition against Husband, granted ex parte by Judge William Spahn Jr. of the Lancaster County Court of Common Pleas. The PFA was issued solely for Wife's protection and did not extend to the minor children, permitting Husband limited contact with Wife for child-related matters, though boundaries remained unclear and complicated. This filing was premeditated, as Wife had threatened similar action in February, and was retaliatory rather than safety-based, as she stated in writing less than a week prior (March 31-April 2 email exchange), "I am not personally afraid of you." In her application:
 - a. **Section 9 (Most Recent Incident of Abuse):** Wife cited the following as abusive:
 - o Husband's statement, "Please stand down, agree to a custody agreement and settle this peacefully," from communications around April 1-2, 2021.

- An April 1-2 email where Husband signed as "your (still) loving husband," which Wife summarized as claiming she breached the marital contract by withdrawing "all my love and support" (a quote from their wedding vows). Husband clarifies this email addressed Wife's restriction of communication and child access amid her ongoing abduction.
- April 1 interactions (8:00 a.m. and 3:15 p.m.) where Wife referenced eldest daughter IMR providing a "written account" after Husband offered her the choice to leave school with him (during Wife's abduction); IMR chose to remain with Wife, and Husband honored her decision.
- April 4 "chalk note" on public sidewalk, where Husband left loving messages for the children, stating he loved them and would see them soon.
- April 5 additional chalk notes and a confrontation where Husband requested return of the children (unaware of the PFA, as he had not been served). Officer Kauffman noted no violation. Wife also referenced prior wellness checks by Officer Rodriguez on March 31 and April 1, claiming Husband alleged kidnapping; Husband confirms these checks were requested due to daughters' distressed calls and lack of response after confronting Wife, amid her withholding.

b. Section 10 (Prior Incidents of Abuse): Wife alleged:

- During 2018 pregnancy, Husband employed "silent treatment" and refused aid/comfort for months (partially accurate, but contextualized by mutual silence after Wife expressed unhappiness with Husband as father of the expected child and their two daughters).
 - Persistent refusal to divorce while living with a new partner; offered to take daughter home for spring break, causing her worry of abduction (Husband notes daughter never previously feared this; any concern stemmed from Wife's alienation).
 - October 25 (year unclear, possibly 2015) refusal to divorce during alleged "psychotic break."
 - Description of an "other personality" (Aggroed) having intercourse with Wife (Husband clarifies this as a post-2015 recovery nickname change, not indicating multiple personality disorder, but marking personal growth after spontaneous sobriety on October 19, 2015).
2. **April 5, 2021 (Same Day):** In "Visit Tonight" email thread, Husband notified intent to visit children at Wife's East Market Street property. Interaction lasted ~3 minutes: Wife directed children upstairs upon Husband's approach, denied access, informed him of PFA, and requested he leave; Husband complied. Wife called police, resulting in harassment citation.
 3. **April 15, 2021:** Husband filed multiple documents-
 - He filed a criminal complaint for official oppression against Judge Sphan Jr. with the District Attorney,
 - He filed a miscaptioned Petition for Habeas Corpus Ad Subjiciendum

- He filed an Emergency Writ of Mandamus for Rule 60 Void Order
4. **April 16, 2021:** Merrill Spahn Jr. “bravely ran away away” and issued an order to “Forward all such documentation to Judge Stedman for whatever action is deemed required.”
 5. **April 19, 2021:** Blair files a 66 page letter describing the depth of wrongdoing by having granted the PFA.
 6. **April 27, 2021:** Blair files multiple claims
 - 1 page notice of theft
 - 1 page notice of Trespass
 - 6 page notice of harm
 7. **April 27, 2021:** The psychological evaluation, results released on April 27, 2021, showed Husband was entirely fit to parent, in remission despite Wife's false claims, and competent as custodian. To quote:
 - “Ability to provide basic care: In Blair’s case there has been no information to indicate that he has any sort of difficulty providing for the basic care of his children.”
 - “Ability to ensure the safety of the child: Blair did not provide any information that would suggest that there is a concern regarding his ability to ensure the safety of his children.”
 - “Ability to provide emotional support and warmth to the children: Blair showed this psychologist pictures and videos with his children that seem to suggest that they have a warm connection, and that he is able to provide his children with emotional support and warmth.”
 - “Ability to provide intellectual/cognitive stimulation for the child: In this area, there are no concerns. Blair is highly intelligent and very accomplished, and is able to provide intellectual and cognitive stimulation without any difficulty.”
 - “Ability to provide guidance and boundaries: Other than [his relationship with Alene’s friend Kathryn soon after their split], there is no evidence that Blair would have difficulty providing his children with boundaries and guidance.”
 - “Ability to provide the child with a stable home and family life: He seems able to provide for a stable home life.”
 - Also, Blair asked to be evaluated for his competency to stand trial in court, and he was found competent, based on his responses to McKee, G (1998).”
 8. There is no mention or concern in the psychological evaluation of Husband regarding a psychotic break in October 2020.
 9. Wife’s claim of a psychotic break by Husband was objectively and knowingly false.
 10. Husband delivered to Wendy Chan and Wife a copy of the psychological assessment by April 27, 2021, and informed judges via mail and docket filings to demonstrate mental and parental fitness and refute Wife's allegations.
 11. **April 27, 2021:** Stedman issues a Continuance order - “And Now, 04/27/2021 Because, Plaintiff’s attorney needs more time to prepare, this matter is continued until 5/25/2021 at 1pm. All other provisions of the temporary protective order dated 04/04/2021 shall remain in full force and effect until further order of the court. By the Court: Crain W. Stedman Judge.

12. **May 25, 2021:** Full hearing on the PFA
- Notably, no witnesses were called, evidencing the continuance request as bad faith.
 - Wife answered “yes” to fearing for her life, but provided no reasoning, omitted it from her application, and never repeated it; the court found it incredible.
13. **May 26, 2021:** PFA Order dismissed “ORDER DISMISSED AFTER A HEARING AN NOW, THIS 25TH DAY OF MAY, 2021, AFTER A HEARING THE COURT DETERMINES THAT PLAINTIFF HAS FAILED TO MEET THE BURNDEN OF PROOF. 1. THIS MATTER IS DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE 2. THE CONTINUED TEMPORARY ORDER (FILED ON 4/27/2021 2:52:00 PM) IS HEREBY DISMISSED BY THE COURT: CRAIG W. STEDMAN, JUDGE.
14. **June 16, 2021:** Post-PFA dismissal, after hearing before Judge Stedman and custody conference with Officer Penn Glazier (but pre-custody order), Husband emailed Wife's attorney Wendy Chan, copied to Wife: [Full letter as provided, with children's initials replaced as IMR, EJR, JFR for consistency].

"Hey Wendy,

Thanks for your note suggesting I consider getting legal counsel. As it turns out I attribute our family distress largely to your involvement and advice. The before and after of your involvement is stark:

Prior to your involvement- Alene had a multi million dollar settlement in hand with my full consent and thousands of dollars per month to support her.

Prior to your involvement- The girls were happy, healthy, well, and had loving relationships with the adults and each other. Alene, me, and Kathryn were functional friends to the point where we were even able to live together successfully for approximately a month in the same house. We managed to work it out while 319 Locust Lane was undergoing repairs for sale and then mutually chose to part ways after the sale.

In our current state- which started after Alene followed your advice to unilaterally take the kids, which happened immediately after almost losing possession of her house because of different advice from you- our family is traumatized. In less than 3 months under Alene's sole care, [middle daughter EJR] has gone from being a happy, healthy kid, with positive relationships to a stressed out, fearful, binge eating diabetic. [oldest daughter IMR] is a giant emotional wreck and by every piece of evidence I have is now dysfunctional while trying to put on a strong face to support Alene. It's way more than any 11 year old should be tasked to handle. And I have no evidence whatsoever regarding [youngest son JFR] as I've been kept entirely at bay since March 28th, 2021.

Prior to this we struggled, but figured things out. Since you've been here I've been drug into multiple frivolous court cases for complete nonsense where neither harm, intent to harm, crime, or intent to break laws ever occurred. I'm a peaceful man, and live with purpose and intention to do no harm and supply notice of my intentions so other parties have time to respond before I act. I've been slandered, insulted, dehumanized, and mischaracterized by each of you. You each find ways to twist my words and deeds into the worst possible interpretations for the courts and/or with age inappropriate conversations with my kids. You've kept me from my offspring while they're clearly being traumatized for the last 80 days. You're wracking up billable hours, while Alene keeps losing court cases and the physical signs of my kids' depression keep increasing.

You are the most reckless attorney I've encountered in 20 years of various forms of business and startups. Alene is an emotional wreck and making horrible choices, which you seem to influence, and it's confusing and saddening to watch her oscillate emotional stances from "He won't let me go!" to "He's replacing me!" within 5 minutes of testimony [in the PFA hearing]. I have low hopes for any of you to change your ways voluntarily.

Unfortunately, I think I'm in a race against the clock for when [EJR] goes from depressed, panicked, fearful, diabetic with an eating disorder to a full blown suicidal 9-year old under Alene's current ability to care for her. I estimate I have about 3 months or less for this transition. Depression runs in the family, this situation is more than enough to trigger it, and evidence points to her getting worse.

I'm praying to god for an intervention and hoping that you all stand down, stop this harmful course, and find a path that isn't so destructive to Alene's finances, relationships within our family, doesn't exacerbate my kids' imminent health problems or worse of all leads to suicidal attempts by Evie. In case divine intervention fails to appear I'm making tangible plans.

I'm working on scheduling time with police, involving children and youth, filing a PFA, figuring out a path with the kids' counselors (which now they need whereas before they did not), and filing criminal complaints. Alene, due to your (Wendy) advice, is harming our son and daughters, and out of necessity I'm going to dedicate every spare moment of my life to protecting them from the current set of choices and disastrous consequences you, and Alene are making. My babies need and deserve nothing less.

To be clear, I want to do exactly none of this. I managed to go 41 years with nothing more than a few traffic tickets in the legal system. I run multiple businesses experiencing various stages of success and trouble and would rather devote my time to other more positive things. I want roller coasters at theme

parks and movie nights with popcorn and the kids. But you guys are giving me no choice!

Alene's continued excuse for holding onto the kids is that I'm having a psychotic break, but there's no basis for this. Alene has brought it up in 2 court cases now, and neither judge thought it was relevant while ruling in my favor. Apparently your concerns of too many grammatical colons for a neophyte "pro se litigant" and me writing love notes to my girls on cardstock aren't enough to sway the court of harm or intent to harm.

Judge Steadman said "I sincerely believe Alene was afraid, but I have to assess if a reasonable person would be afraid, and this does not rise to that standard." You, Wendy, said in the custody hearing that I had a "glowing psychological evaluation," and that "He [Blair] apparently got better." Given that you and all the other professionals agree that I'm well, I'm forced to conclude that Alene taking unilateral control and keeping unilateral control of the kids is sinister. Holding onto the kids appears as some form of divorce process control, some type of ransom/extortion, or some way to inflict me with intense emotional distress, but the damage it's actually causing is to [IMR, EJR, and JFR]. That damage is now, current, present, expressing itself in definable medical problems, and it's mounting every day.

I have every intention to hold you personally liable for your role in our family trauma, and see no reason to bring another attorney into this mix. It's terrible, expensive, and tricky to unravel enough as it is.

Alene, it's been two weeks and no custody order is here. You have no right to hold them. It's been 80 traumatic days. It's time to stop this madness, voluntarily let them come to my house, start healing our family, and take a very different path than the one that's causing a nuclear meltdown in our kids and family, and one that poses and presents severe health problems and risks to our precious babies.

Alene, I'm asking again for the third time, please tell me a day and time, let's sit down for lunch in a public place, and try to work out even just the smallest piece of this nightmare peacefully and privately.

4. DETAILED FAMILY LAW AT THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

Judge Christopher A. Hackman was assigned to Reich v Reich divorce matter by last-name-lottery. He presided over the Divorce, Custody, and Support matter from date of filing of the matters in 2021. I submitted a fair number of filings including criminal complaints alleging

Aiding and Abetting kidnapping by wife. As a result of those filings inclusive of criminal complaints the entire bench at the Court of Common Pleas Lancaster County, Pennsylvania recused themselves in May of 2024.

At the request of Lancaster CCP President Judge David Ashworth, Supreme Court Chief Justice Debra Todd personally reassigned Senior Retired Judge William P Mahon to the case on June 18, 2024.

So, the family law matters related to

a. HACKMAN ERA DETAILED CUSTODY PROCEEDINGS

Judge Christopher A. Hackman was assigned to Reich v Reich divorce matter by last-name-lottery. He presided over the Divorce, Custody, and Support matter from the date of filing of the matters in 2021. I submitted a fair number of filings including criminal complaints alleging Aiding and Abetting kidnapping by wife. As a result of that criminal complaint and its predecessors the entire bench at the Court of Common Pleas Lancaster County, Pennsylvania recused themselves. Supreme Court Chief Justice Debra Todd personally reassigned Senior Retired Judge William P Mahon to the case in June 18, 2024. So, in the “Hackman Era” sections I’m noting the timeline relevant to his actions from his receipt of the cases to his recusal and appointment to the Mahon Court.

1. **April 28, 2021:** Husband filed for custody and PFA against Wife (self only). The PFA was merged into the Custody matter.
2. **April 29, 2021:** Custody conference scheduled for June 3, 2021, at 1:30 PM in Conference Room 305 with Glazier CCO, Penn B.
3. **April 30, 2021:** Custody Conference Scheduling Order issued; no temporary order requested. Parties required to attend "Focus on Children" seminar.
4. **May 26, 2021:** Plaintiff's correspondence filed.
5. **May 28, 2021:** Affidavit of Identity and Ownership filed by Plaintiff.
6. **June 1, 2021:** Entry of Appearance by Kristin E. Jaquis, Esq., on behalf of Alene Reich.
7. **June 3, 2021:** Parties met with custody counselor Penn Glazier, who recommended 100% legal and physical custody to Wife; Judge Hackman signed without listed reasons, depriving Husband of parental rights despite no crimes, threats, or harm by Husband. Recommended Order with follow-up conference.
8. **June 3, 2021:** Defendant's Criminal History Certification and Disclosure of Household Members filed.
9. **June 10, 2021:** Hearing before Magistrate Judge Scott Albert dismissed harassment claim: “Blair’s trip to Alene’s house did not rise to the level of harassment.”
10. **~June 10, 2021:** Blair filed criminal complaints against Penn Glazier, Wendy Chan, Judge Hackman for ex parte communication (evidenced by Wife emailing verbatim order language pre-publication), and Prothonotary Andrew Spade for refusing docket filings.

11. **June 17, 2021:** Affidavit of Harm Parenting filed by Alene Wilmoth Reich.
12. **June 18, 2021:** CCO Custody Order issued: Temporary custody to Mother; Father partial supervised custody; follow-up conference scheduled for September 3, 2021.
13. **June 21, 2021:** Affidavit and Petition to Strike Void Judgment filed by Plaintiff.
14. **June 21, 2021:** Affidavit to Disqualify Presiding Official under 28 USC Section 455 for Failure to Remain Impartial filed by Plaintiff.
15. **June 23, 2021:** Husband noticed the PFA case demanding vacation of order and damages, citing Trezevant v. City of Tampa (1994) inflation-adjusted at \$2,700/minute (\$8,100/minute punitive), totaling \$12.8 billion for 275 days of separation against each defendant personally and officially.
16. **June 24, 2021:** Email discussion on EJR's health; Wife noted likely diabetes diagnosis from ~90-pound gain in three months under her unilateral care. Husband filed PFA against Wife on EJR's behalf; moved to custody case.
17. **July 6, 2021:** Notice of Ongoing Harm, Affidavit of Fact, Affidavit and Demand to Vacate Void Order for Fraud by the Court, Affidavit and Demand for Money Damages for Harm Caused to Blair filed by Plaintiff.
18. **July 21, 2021:** Plaintiff's Affidavit and Demand for Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Subjiciendum and Writ of Certiorari filed.
19. **August 3, 2021:** Notice of Ongoing Harm, Affidavit of Fact, Affidavit and Demand to Vacate Void Order for Fraud by the Court, Affidavit and Demand for Money Damages for Harm Caused to Blair filed by Plaintiff.
20. **August 12, 2021:** Order issued: Custody conference rescheduled to September 14, 2021, due to court conflict.
21. **August 25, 2021:** Mail returned for order dated August 12, 2021, to Kristin E. Jaquis, Esq.
22. **August 30, 2021:** Hearing rescheduled to September 14, 2021.
23. **September 14, 2021:** Separate custody hearing; Husband stated "I do not consent to this hearing," recognizing bias against men in Lancaster County. Recommended Order issued.
24. **September 15, 2021:** Hearing scheduled for October 26, 2021.
25. **September 15, 2021:** CCO Custody Order issued: Hearing set; prior order remains.
26. **October 26, 2021:** Courtroom hearing before Judge Hackman; limited time led to follow-up on December 20, 2021. Husband and children remained separated by Hackman's order. Order issued: Temporary amendments; custody to remain per June 17, 2021 order with changes to supervision and counseling.
27. **October 28, 2021:** Order details entered.
28. **December 9, 2021:** Hearing scheduled for December 20, 2021.
29. **December 20, 2021:** Hackman allowed Wife ~45 minutes testimony (e.g., 2012 insult, 2020 pool incident, alleged sex toy); stopped trial mid-testimony, canceled second half and children's testimony; stated "there was no reason now or in the past that Alene should have taken [Blair's] children," yet ignored his own prior unjust order. Drafted new order granting Husband weekend time toward 50%. Temporary order issued; full-day follow-up scheduled for March 3, 2022.
30. **December 20, 2021:** Hearing scheduled for March 3, 2022.

31. **January 2, 2022:** Judicial Notice of Police Enforcement by Affidavit filed by Plaintiff.
32. **January 2, 2022:** Affidavit of Probable Cause: Judicial Misconduct Leading to Suicidal Thoughts and Action of Minor Children filed by Plaintiff.
33. **January 7, 2022:** Confidential Request for Investigation filed by Plaintiff.
34. **January 16, 2022:** Second Amended Order issued: Hearing continued to January 16, 2024 (typographical error in docket; context suggests 2022); prior order remains.
35. **February 3, 2022:** Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus by Affidavit filed by Plaintiff.
36. **February 20, 2022:** Exhibits filed by Plaintiff.
37. **March 3, 2022:** Hearing; Hackman altered order to 50/50 custody, adding “No parent shall make any significant decisions relating to legal custody without the assent of the other parent except in the event of an emergency” to curb Wife's unilateral actions. Order issued: Prior order remains; full-day hearing scheduled for June 7, 2022.
38. **March 4, 2022:** Hearing scheduled for June 7, 2022.
39. **May 17, 2022:** Hearing rescheduled to August 30, 2022, due to court conflict.
40. **May 18, 2022:** Order issued: Hearing rescheduled to August 30, 2022.
41. **Summer 2022:** Wife unilaterally withdrew children from private school despite Husband's dissent.
42. **August 31, 2022:** Custody hearing; Husband noted Wife's order violations (logged with police, contempt filings), communication disruptions, emotional manipulation/alienation, and school removal. Hackman ruled children stay in private school, reinforcing assent language. Order issued: Follow-up hearing scheduled for November 30, 2022; shared custody on 2-2-3 schedule; legal custody shared with specifics on school, vaccinations, etc.
43. **August 31, 2022:** Hearing scheduled for November 30, 2022.
44. **September 14, 2022:** Letter filed by Plaintiff regarding custody concerns.
45. **November 1, 2022:** Criminal Record/Abuse History Verification filed for Alene Reich.
46. **November 3, 2022:** Criminal Record/Abuse History Verification filed for Alene Wilmoth Reich.
47. **November 7, 2022:** Criminal Record/Abuse History Verification e-filed for Alene Reich.
48. **November 30, 2022:** Most recent hearing under Hackman; Hackman issued final order repeating prior terms with holiday specifics, maintaining assent clause to address Wife's behavior.
49. **December 7, 2022:** Order issued (final custody order details as per agreement).
 - a. This is the only order issued in the Custody matter that actually means lawful standards. Not because the court did it correctly, but because the Couple voluntarily agreed to the terms.
50. **December 8, 2022:** Memo/Letter filed by Plaintiff.
51. **December 13, 2022:** Requests for Transcripts filed (for December 20, 2021, and March 3, 2022 hearings).
52. **December 19, 2022:** Request for Transcript e-filed by Wendy Chan on behalf of Alene Wilmoth Reich.
53. **December 28, 2022:** Transcripts filed for December 20, 2021, and March 3, 2022 hearings.
54. **September 29, 2023:** Order issued: Hearing continued to November 30, 2023.

55. **November 9, 2023:** Plaintiff's Petition to Modify Custody filed.
56. **December 20, 2023:** Opinion and Order issued (final custody order details).
 - a. This order is unlawful as it puts restrictions on my freedom of speech, which as a fit parent the state lacks sufficient interest to curtail my rights.
57. **January 8, 2024:** Petition for Reconsideration of Custody Order filed by Plaintiff.
58. **January 16, 2024:** Amended Order issued: Hearing continued (typographical error in docket; context suggests continuation).
59. **January 31, 2024:** Father's Motion to Compel Scholastic Obligation filed.
60. **February 3, 2024:** Defendant's Answer to Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Scholastic Obligation e-filed.
61. **February 14, 2024:** Certificate of Service and Defendant's Answer e-filed.
62. **February 23, 2024:** Order denying Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Scholastic Obligation.
63. **March 18, 2024:** Plaintiff's Confidential Request for Investigation filed.
64. **March 22, 2024:** Plaintiff's Correspondence filed.
65. **April 4, 2024:** Motion to Reconsider JFR's Court Ordered Therapy by Affidavit filed by Plaintiff.
66. **April 5, 2024:** Order denying Father's Motion for Make-Up Days.
67. **April 22, 2024:** Father's Motion for Abduction Prevention Measures filed.
68. **April 30, 2024:** Private Criminal Complaint filed by Plaintiff.
69. **April 30, 2024:** Judicial Notice filed by Plaintiff.
70. **April 30, 2024:** Confidential Request for Investigation filed by Plaintiff.
71. **May 2, 2024:** Complaint (Private Criminal Complaint) filed by Plaintiff.
72. The filings in April and May of 2024 led to a full Bench Recusal by the Lancaster CCP.
73. **June 18, 2024:** Request for Assignment of Judge filed by President Judge David L. Ashworth; recommends William P. Mahon with approval of Chief Justice Debra Todd.

After Hackman and the entire bench recused themselves, on June 18, 2024, Supreme Court Chief Justice Debra Todd assigned Senior Retired Judge William P. Mahon to the case. At that time, Hackman's reign over the case ends.

b. HACKMAN ERA DETAILED SUPPORT PROCEEDINGS

Family support dockets are restricted from full public online access per Pennsylvania guidelines, so this is reconstructed from accessible sources including the February 16, 2024 Superior Court memorandum (J-S45044-23), which details the timeline, filings, hearings, and orders. Entries are in chronological order where dates are specified; some interim conferences/hearings are noted without exact sub-dates due to summarization in records.

Case Identification:

1. **Plaintiff:** Alene W. Reich
2. **Defendant:** Blair J.E. Reich
3. **PACSES Case Number:** 967300735

4. **Docket Number:** 2021-00333
5. **Superior Court Appeal No.:** 875 MDA 2023

Background and Procedural History:

6. **August 2, 2002:** Parties married.
7. **November 30, 2019:** Parties separated, establishing the date of separation for economic claims.
8. **September 16, 2020:** A related divorce complaint (CI-20-06144) was filed, with support issues intertwined with economic claims.
9. **March 2, 2021:** Mother (Alene W. Reich) filed a Complaint for Support against Father (Blair J. Reich), seeking child support and alimony pendente lite (APL). The case was initiated in the Domestic Relations Section and assigned to Judge Christopher A. Hackman.
10. **Post-Filing (2021) and Throughout 2021-2023:** Initial support conferences were held, followed by several additional support conferences and hearings, some of which were rescheduled. Multiple interim support orders were entered, focusing on income from Father's businesses: Steam Monsters Corp. and Peace, Prosperity, and Freedom LLC.
11. **February 16, 2022:** Father filed a Petition to Modify Support, raising issues concerning income calculation and business expenses.
12. **March 14, 2022:** This date served as the effective date for the initial support calculation, though interim orders were in effect prior.
13. **April 18, 2023:** A Complex Support Hearing was held before Judge Christopher A. Hackman. Both parties testified extensively on income sources, business expenses, and deductions. Father's 2022 salary from Steam Monsters Corp. was \$96,000 (reduced from \$120,000 due to company policy). His 99% interest in Peace, Prosperity, and Freedom LLC (PPF) showed a \$334,000 business income after court-approved deductions from 2021 gross receipts of \$455,076. Deductions included items like return of capital (\$50,000), supplies/software (\$16,398), out-of-state meals (\$5,000), maintenance (\$425), office radiator (\$3,258), insurance (\$495), legal/professional (\$500), and sales (\$45,000). The court considered business expenses, deducting reasonable ones and adding back unreasonable personal expenses (e.g., groceries, vehicle, pool, home renovations). Private school tuition for the three minor children (~\$30,000/year, paid by Father per custody agreement at Susquehanna Waldorf School) was also discussed. The record was kept open post-hearing for additional evidence, which Father did not provide.
14. **May 16, 2023:** A Final Support Order was entered, affirming support amounts (unallocated child support and APL) and stating Father's responsibility for the children's Waldorf School tuition/costs, which were factored into the guidelines. The income basis included Father's 2022 salary and PPF's 2021 amended tax return (no 2022 PPF return was submitted despite continuances). No formal business valuations were conducted, with focus on income from Father's 99% interest in PPF (paramour owns 1%) and Steam Monsters Corp. minority interest with W2 salary.

15. **June 23, 2023:** Father filed a Concise Statement of Errors Complained of on Appeal under Pa.R.A.P. 1925(b), challenging: (1) the use of 2021 vs. 2022 income; (2) insufficient business expense consideration; (3) lack of consideration for 2022 business performance beyond his control; (4) lack of consideration for 2023 income reduction; and (5) income being solely from minority shareholder status.

16. **July 27, 2023:** The Trial Court filed its Pa.R.A.P. 1925(a) Opinion, addressing the appeal issues and affirming that income was based on competent evidence, reasonable expenses were deducted, and unreasonable ones were added back. The opinion noted no evidence for 2022/2023 reductions and confirmed income from W2 salary and PPF payments, not solely minority interest.

17. **Post-July 27, 2023:** The appeal was docketed in the Pennsylvania Superior Court as No. 875 MDA 2023.

18. **February 16, 2024:** The Superior Court affirmed the May 16, 2023 order in a non-precedential memorandum (J-S45044-23), finding no abuse of discretion and that findings were supported by evidence, including the consideration of shared custody and private school costs.

19. **Children:** There are three minor children born of the marriage, who are in shared physical custody equally per a related custody order.

Support Calculations: Support was unallocated (combined child support/APL), with guidelines applied including private school costs.

Summary of Support Orders and Their Terms:

21. **May 3, 2021 Order (Effective March 2, 2021):** Defendant ordered to pay \$7,102.26 monthly for support, with a credit of \$2,102.78 for direct payments.

22. **February 18, 2022 Order (Effective September 29, 2021):** Defendant ordered to pay \$8,996.62 monthly for support.

23. **May 15, 2023 Order (Effective March 14, 2022):** Defendant ordered to pay \$6,769.65 per month in combined child support and APL, **plus \$677 per month in arrears.**

24. **May 15, 2023 Order, Second Tier (Effective July 1, 2022):** Defendant ordered to pay \$5,047.80 per month in combined child support and APL, **plus \$505 per month in arrears.**

25. **April 16, 2024 Order (Effective November 21, 2023):** Defendant ordered to pay \$2,806.82 monthly for support.

26. **April 16, 2024 Order, Second Tier (Effective June 1, 2024):** Defendant ordered to pay \$3,106.82 monthly for support.

Seizure and Freezing Activity (up to June 2024):

27. **Actual Seizures Applied (as reported by the Financial Officer in the October 8, 2025 letter, with relevant dates):**

28. **February 12, 2024:** \$7,043.00 seized from account #XXXXXX891-3.

Orders to Freeze Assets (as of the respective dates):

- 28.1. **October 7, 2022:** Order to Freeze Assets up to \$38,115.36 belonging to Blair J. Reich in account #XXXXXX891-3 at Digital Federal Credit Union.
- 28.2. **March 31, 2023:** Order to Freeze Assets up to \$53,824.32 belonging to Blair J. Reich in account #XXXXXX891-3 at Digital Federal Credit Union.
- 28.3. **September 15, 2023:** Order to Freeze Assets up to \$39,224.79 belonging to Blair J. Reich in account #XXXXXX891-1 at Digital Federal Credit Union.
- 28.4. **December 29, 2023:** Order to Freeze Assets up to \$40,864.10 belonging to Blair J. Reich in account #XXXXXX891-3 at Digital Federal Credit Union.

Orders to Seize Assets (as of the respective dates):

- 29.1. **October 30, 2023:** Order to Seize Assets not to exceed \$39,208.56 belonging to Blair J. Reich in account #XXXXXX891-1 at Digital Federal Credit Union.
- 29.2. **February 2, 2024:** Order to Seize Assets not to exceed \$40,864.10 belonging to Blair J. Reich in account #XXXXXX891-3 at Digital Federal Credit Union.

Chronology of Release Orders (up to June 2024):

30. **October 21, 2022:** Order to Release Assets belonging to Blair J. Reich in account #XXXXXX891-1 (Digital Federal Credit Union), vacating the Court Order dated October 7, 2022.
31. **April 6, 2023:** Order to Release Assets belonging to Blair J. Reich in account #XXXXXX891-1 (Digital Federal Credit Union), vacating the Court Order dated March 31, 2023. After Hackman and the entire bench recused themselves, on June 18, 2024, Supreme Court Chief Justice Debra Todd assigned Senior Retired Judge William P. Mahon to the case. At that time, Hackman's reign over the case ends.

c. HACKMAN ERA DETAILED DIVORCE PROCEEDINGS

Judge Christopher A. Hackman presided over the Reich v. Reich divorce matter from its filing in 2020 until the bench's recusal in 2024. This section details the timeline of key filings, motions, orders, and events under Hackman's oversight, highlighting procedural violations, Husband's challenges to jurisdiction and fraud, and the transition to Senior Retired Judge William P. Mahon.

1. **September 16, 2020:** Wife filed Complaint in Divorce under Section 3301(c) or (d) (irretrievably broken marriage), initiating the action. Caption entered as Alene Reich vs. Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich.
2. **October 5, 2020:** Praecipe to Reinstate Divorce Action filed by Wife's attorney Wendy Chan.
3. **October 26, 2020:** Affidavit of Service of Complaint in Divorce via personal service filed by Wife's attorney.
4. **October 30, 2020:** Affidavit of Service for Complaint in Divorce filed.

5. **April 8, 2021:** Statement of Intention to Proceed filed by Husband.
6. **April 29, 2021:** Motion to Compel filed by Wife's attorney Kristin E. Jaquis, with Certificate of Service and Compliance.
7. **May 5, 2021:** Order granting Motion to Compel in part: Husband directed to respond to specific interrogatories and produce documents within 30 days; sanctions possible for non-compliance.
8. **May 19, 2021:** Order scheduling Family Business Court presentation for June 1, 2021.
9. **May 24, 2021:** Husband filed copies of various documents, including Notice, Divorce Complaint, PFA documents, and York PA Recorder of Deeds records.
10. **May 26, 2021:** Husband filed Affidavit of Identity and Ownership.
11. **May 28, 2021:** Husband filed copies of Non-Appearance Ex-Parte Request for Disclosure of Bonds and Notice of Deficiencies.
12. **June 1, 2021:** Family Business Court hearing held; order issued scheduling further presentation for June 1, 2021 (duplicate entry noted).
13. **June 2, 2021:** Order on Motion to Compel: Husband to provide documents and interrogatories within 30 days.
14. **June 14, 2021:** Husband filed Notice of Objection.
15. **June 28, 2021:** Husband filed Affidavit and Demand for Dismissal for Lack of Jurisdiction, Demand for Divorce under 23 Pa.C.S. § 3301(a), and related demands.
16. **June 29, 2021:** Husband filed Private Criminal Complaint against Judge David Workman and Affidavit and Notice of Default Judgment.
17. **July 6, 2021:** Husband filed Notice with Proposed Order.
18. **July 21, 2021:** Husband filed Affidavit and Demand for Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Subjiciendum and Writ of Certiorari.
19. **July 23, 2021:** Motion for Contempt and Sanctions filed by Wife's attorney McKenna Adams.
20. **July 23, 2021:** Order granting sanctions: Husband to pay \$1,500 to Wife by August 31, 2021, and comply with discovery.
21. **August 3, 2021:** Husband filed Notice of Ongoing Harm, Affidavit and Demand to Vacate Void Order for Fraud.
22. **August 4, 2021:** Husband filed Affidavit and Demand for Sanctions Against Wendy Chan and Alene Reich.
23. **August 16, 2023:** Order on Motion to Quash Subpoena and for Protective Order: Terms agreed for discovery from Steem Monsters Corp., including confidentiality.
24. **August 16, 2023:** Election to Resume Maiden Name filed by Wife (from Alene Reich to Alene Marie Wilmoth).
25. **September 13, 2022:** Confidential Document Form and Inventory filed by Husband.
26. **November 1, 2022:** Husband filed Pre-Trial Exhibits (not printed).
27. **November 8, 2022:** Certificate of Service for Plaintiff's Request for Production of Documents filed by Wife's attorney.
28. **November 13, 2023:** Defendant's First Request for Interrogatories and Production of Documents filed.
29. **December 5, 2022:** Husband filed Affidavit and Demand for Sanctions Against Wendy Chan and Alene Reich for Delaying Equitable Distribution.

30. **December 20, 2022:** Opinion and Order issued (custody-related, but noted in divorce docket for overlap).
31. **January 9, 2023:** Motions for Bifurcation and to Compel filed by Husband.
32. **January 30, 2023:** Rule entered on Motion to Bifurcate: Returnable in writing within 10 days.
33. **February 2, 2023:** Inventory filed by Wife.
34. **February 9, 2023:** Plaintiff's Answer to Defendant's Motion to Bifurcate filed by Wife's attorney.
35. **February 12, 2023:** Order denying Motion to Compel Prerequisite Documents.
36. **February 14, 2023:** Husband's Essentials Only Pre-Trial Statement filed.
37. **February 20, 2023:** Defendant's Exhibits filed.
38. **February 23, 2023:** Order denying Motion to Bifurcate.
39. **March 18, 2024:** Defendant's Confidential Request for Investigation filed.
40. **March 22, 2024:** Defendant's Letter and Affidavit filed.
41. **March 25, 2024:** Defendant's Request for Investigation filed.
42. **April 9, 2024:** Motions for Appointment of Master and Amended Motion filed by Husband.
43. **April 18, 2024:** Order denying Motion for Divorce Master and Special Relief Hearings (inventories incomplete; await discovery motion).
44. **April 22, 2024:** Defendant's Private Criminal Complaint and Complaint Form filed.
45. **April 30, 2024:** Defendant's Judicial Notice Regarding Improper Venue filed.
46. **May 1, 2024:** Mail returned for order to Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich.
47. **May 16, 2024:** Second Pre-Trial Statement Summary by Affidavit filed by Husband.
48. **May 29, 2024:** Divorce Officer Pre-Trial Conference scheduled for June 5, 2024; Divorce Officer Hearing for August 7, 2025 (typographical error in docket; likely 2024).
49. **June 18, 2024:** Request for Assignment of Judge filed by President Judge David L. Ashworth; recommends William P. Mahon with approval of Chief Justice Debra Todd. This marks the end of Hackman's oversight, with reassignment to Mahon.

After Hackman and the entire bench recused themselves, on June 18, 2024, Supreme Court Chief Justice Debra Todd assigned Senior Retired Judge William P. Mahon to the case. At that time, Hackman's reign over the case ends.

d. MAHON ERA CUSTODY PROCEEDINGS

The Mahon era commenced on June 18, 2024, with Supreme Court Chief Justice Debra Todd's assignment of Senior Retired Judge William P. Mahon following the recusal of the entire Lancaster County Court of Common Pleas bench due to Husband's criminal complaints. This section details events under Mahon's oversight from April 2025 (pre-assignment filings leading into his term) through December 4, 2025, emphasizing motions, orders, hearings, and violations of due process, parental rights, and jurisdictional challenges raised by Husband.

1. **April 4, 2025:** Motion to Reconsider JFR's Court Ordered Therapy by Affidavit filed by Husband (Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich), pro se.

2. **April 30, 2025:** Confidential Request for Investigation filed by Husband, pro se.
3. **May 2, 2025:** Private Criminal Complaint filed by Husband, pro se.
4. **June 17, 2025:** Order denying Motion to Reconsider JFR's Court Ordered Therapy filed April 4, 2025.
5. **June 17, 2025:** Order following record custody conference: Physical custody of minor children (IR, ER, JR) remains with Mother pending full hearing; telephone contact with Father permitted with Mother's consent.
6. **July 3, 2025:** Order denying Motion to Reconsider JFR's Court Ordered Therapy.
7. **July 23, 2025:** Order scheduling final Zoom conference for August 1, 2025, to attempt agreement and avoid children's testimony.
8. **July 25, 2025:** Order denying Motion to Reconsider JER's Court Ordered Therapy filed April 4, 2025.
9. **July 29, 2025:** Motion to Strike and Other Motions by Affidavit filed by Husband, pro se.
10. **August 4, 2025:** Hearings scheduled for August 22, 2025 (custody hearing, two entries).
11. **August 14, 2025:** Motion on Relevant History, Jurisdictional Challenges, Objections, Parental Fitness, Common Law, and Due Process Failure by Trial by Affidavit filed by Husband, pro se; Criminal Record/Abuse History Verification and Confidential Information Form filed.
12. **August 27, 2025:** Custody Case Management Order continuing August 22, 2025 hearing to September 5, 2025.
13. **August 27, 2025:** Custody Case Management Order denying Husband's Motion to Recuse: Premised on conspiracy claims involving "negromancy," treason, and sedition; views deemed "sovereign citizen" philosophy; denial based on doctrine of necessity to prevent thwarting judicial process.
14. **August 27, 2025:** Custody Case Management Order denying Husband's Motion to Strike: Would delay custody issues, waste resources, and not serve children's best interests.
15. **September 4, 2025:** Hearings rescheduled for September 5, 2025 (custody hearing, two entries).
16. **September 9, 2025:** Confidential Custody Exhibits (multiple), Exhibits with Index, Confidential Information Form filed (e-filed).
17. **September 10, 2025:** Notice of Electronic Filing generated.
18. **September 11, 2025:** Notice of Electronic Filing generated.
19. **October 9, 2025:** Custody Opinion & Order issued: After hearing with testimony from parties, children, and agreed evaluator; full legal/physical custody to Mother; Father to undergo psychiatric/psychological evaluations within 60 days (provided to court), then parenting counseling; report required for modification; limited telephone/text contact with Mother's consent; Mother to notify emergencies, encourage respect, continue counseling; relocation compliance required.
20. **October 14, 2025:** Judicial Notice of "Tripling Down": 42 USC 1983 Lawsuit, Criminal Complaints, Affidavit of Probable Cause, and Judicial Review by Affidavit filed by Husband, pro se.

21. **October 17, 2025:** Motion to Vacate Final Custody Order pursuant to Rule 60(b) for exceeding subject matter jurisdiction and constitutional violations filed by Husband, pro se.
22. **October 22, 2025:** Order denying Motion to Vacate Custody Order under Rule 60(b).
23. **December 4, 2025:** Motion to Vacate Custody Order pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. 60(b) and for Reconsideration, with Notice and Demand to Cease and Desist Violations, and Notice of Impending Federal Remedies by Declaration filed by Husband, pro se.
24. **December 4, 2025:** Judicial Notice of Judicial Review filed by Husband, pro se.

e. MAHON ERA SUPPORT PROCEEDINGS

The Mahon era began with the reassignment of the case on June 18, 2024, following the recusal of the entire Lancaster County Court of Common Pleas bench due to Husband's criminal complaints. Supreme Court Chief Justice Debra Todd approved the assignment of Senior Retired Judge William P. Mahon. This section details events from the reassignment through December 16, 2025, focusing on filings, motions, orders, and procedural developments under Mahon's oversight.

Family support dockets in Pennsylvania are restricted from full public online access per state privacy guidelines, so direct viewing requires in-person or authorized request through the Lancaster County Domestic Relations Section. However, based on the Pennsylvania Superior Court memorandum opinion (J-S45044-23, No. 875 MDA 2023, dated February 16, 2024), which details the procedural history, and cross-referenced public records, below is a comprehensive reconstruction of the docket timeline. Entries are chronological, focusing on key filings, hearings, orders, and calculations. The case is linked to the parties' divorce (CI-20-06144) and custody (CI-21-02064) matters.

Case Identification:

1. **Plaintiff:** Alene W. Reich
2. **Defendant:** Blair J.E. Reich
3. **PACSES Case Number:** 967300735
4. **Docket Number:** 2021-00333
5. **Superior Court Appeal No.:** 875 MDA 2023

Background and Procedural History:

6. **August 2, 2002:** Parties married.
7. **November 30, 2019:** Parties separated, establishing the date of separation for economic claims.
8. **September 16, 2020:** A related divorce complaint (CI-20-06144) was filed, with support issues intertwined with economic claims.

9. **March 2, 2021:** Mother (Alene W. Reich) filed a Complaint for Support against Father (Blair J. Reich), seeking child support and alimony pendente lite (APL).
10. **Post-March 2, 2021:** Several support conferences and hearings were held, leading to multiple interim orders.
11. **February 16, 2022:** Father filed a Petition to Modify Support, raising issues concerning income calculation and business expenses.
12. **April 18, 2023:** A Complex Support Hearing was held before Judge Christopher A. Hackman. Both parties testified extensively on income sources, including Father's 2022 salary from Steam Monsters Corp. (\$96,000) and his 99% interest in Peace, Prosperity, and Freedom LLC (PPF) which showed a \$334,000 business income after deductions from 2021 gross receipts of \$455,076. The court considered business expenses, deducting reasonable ones and adding back unreasonable personal expenses. Private school tuition for the three minor children (~\$30,000/year, paid by Father per custody agreement) was also discussed. The record was kept open for additional evidence, which Father did not provide.
13. **May 16, 2023:** A Trial Court Order was entered affirming support amounts (unallocated child support and APL) and stating Father's responsibility for the children's Waldorf School tuition/costs, which were factored into the guidelines. The income basis included Father's 2022 salary and PPF's 2021 amended tax return (no 2022 PPF return was submitted despite continuances).
14. **June 23, 2023:** Father filed a Concise Statement of Errors Complained of on Appeal under Pa.R.A.P. 1925(b), challenging: (1) the use of 2021 vs. 2022 income; (2) insufficient business expense consideration; (3) lack of consideration for 2022 business performance beyond his control; (4) lack of consideration for 2023 income reduction; and (5) income being solely from minority shareholder status.
15. **July 27, 2023:** The Trial Court filed its Pa.R.A.P. 1925(a) Opinion, addressing the appeal issues and affirming that income was based on competent evidence, reasonable expenses were deducted, and unreasonable ones were added back.
16. **Post-July 27, 2023:** The appeal was docketed in the Pennsylvania Superior Court as No. 875 MDA 2023.
17. **February 16, 2024:** The Superior Court affirmed the May 16, 2023 order in a non-precedential memorandum, finding no abuse of discretion and that findings were supported by evidence.
18. **Children:** There are three minor children born of the marriage, who are in shared physical custody equally per a related custody order.

19. **Income Determinations:** Father's 2022 salary was \$96,000 (reduced from \$120,000). PPF's 2021 gross receipts were \$455,076, with court-approved deductions for items like return of capital (\$50,000), supplies/software (\$16,398), and out-of-state meals (\$5,000), leading to a net business income of \$334,000. The court rejected additional personal deductions.

20. **Support Calculations:** Support was unallocated (combined child support/APL), with guidelines applied including private school costs.

Summary of Support Orders and Their Terms:

21. **May 3, 2021 Order (Effective March 2, 2021):** Defendant ordered to pay \$7,102.26 monthly for support, with a credit of \$2,102.78 for direct payments.

22. **February 18, 2022 Order (Effective September 29, 2021):** Defendant ordered to pay \$8,996.62 monthly for support.

23. **May 15, 2023 Order (Effective March 14, 2022):** Defendant ordered to pay \$6,769.65 per month in combined child support and APL, **plus \$677 per month in arrears.**

24. **May 15, 2023 Order, Second Tier (Effective July 1, 2022):** Defendant ordered to pay \$5,047.80 per month in combined child support and APL, **plus \$505 per month in arrears.**

25. **April 16, 2024 Order (Effective November 21, 2023):** Defendant ordered to pay \$2,806.82 monthly for support.

26. **April 16, 2024 Order, Second Tier (Effective June 1, 2024):** Defendant ordered to pay \$3,106.82 monthly for support.

Financial Audit Summary (as of October 8, 2025 - Document Page 1):

27. **Total Accruals (charges on case):** \$275,349.95

28. **Total Disbursed (payments on case):** \$232,177.08

29. **Current Support Balance (total outstanding arrears):** \$43,172.87

Seizure and Freezing Activity:

30. **Actual Seizures Applied (as reported by the Financial Officer in the October 8, 2025 letter):**

30.1. **February 12, 2024:** \$7,043.00 seized from account #XXXXXX891-3.

30.2. **February 24, 2025:** \$4,898.40 seized from account #XXXXXX74105.

30.3. **March 3, 2025:** \$2,164.04 seized from account #XXXXXX891-3.

Orders to Freeze Assets (as of the respective dates):

31.1. **October 7, 2022:** Order to Freeze Assets up to \$38,115.36 belonging to Blair J. Reich in account #XXXXXX891-3 at Digital Federal Credit Union.

31.2. **March 31, 2023:** Order to Freeze Assets up to \$53,824.32 belonging to Blair J. Reich in account #XXXXXX891-3 at Digital Federal Credit Union.

31.3. **September 15, 2023:** Order to Freeze Assets up to \$39,224.79 belonging to Blair J. Reich in account #XXXXXX891-1 at Digital Federal Credit Union.

31.4. **December 29, 2023:** Order to Freeze Assets up to \$40,864.10 belonging to Blair J. Reich in account #XXXXXX891-3 at Digital Federal Credit Union.

31.5. **January 10, 2025:** Order to Freeze Assets up to \$32,307.07 belonging to Blair J. Reich in account #XXXXXX891-3 at Digital Federal Credit Union.

31. 31.6. **January 17, 2025:** Order to Freeze Assets up to \$32,307.07 belonging to Blair J. Reich in account #XXXXXX74105 at Northwest Bank.

Orders to Seize Assets (as of the respective dates):

32.1. **October 30, 2023:** Order to Seize Assets not to exceed \$39,208.56 belonging to Blair J. Reich in account #XXXXXX891-1 at Digital Federal Credit Union.

32.2. **February 2, 2024:** Order to Seize Assets not to exceed \$40,864.10 belonging to Blair J. Reich in account #XXXXXX891-3 at Digital Federal Credit Union.

32.3. **February 13, 2025:** Order to Seize Assets not to exceed \$32,307.07 belonging to Blair J. Reich in account #XXXXXX891-3 at Digital Federal Credit Union.

32. 32.4. **February 13, 2025:** Order to Seize Assets not to exceed \$32,307.07 belonging to Blair J. Reich in account #XXXXXX74105 at Northwest Bank.

6. Chronology of Release Orders:

33. **October 21, 2022:** Order to Release Assets belonging to Blair J. Reich in account #XXXXXX891-1 (Digital Federal Credit Union), vacating the Court Order dated October 7, 2022.

34. **April 6, 2023:** Order to Release Assets belonging to Blair J. Reich in account #XXXXXX891-1 (Digital Federal Credit Union), vacating the Court Order dated March 31, 2023.

f. MAHON ERA DIVORCE PROCEEDINGS

The Mahon era began with the reassignment of the case on June 18, 2024, following the recusal of the entire Lancaster County Court of Common Pleas bench due to Husband's criminal complaints. Supreme Court Chief Justice Debra Todd approved the assignment of Senior Retired Judge William P. Mahon. This section details events from the reassignment through December 16, 2025, focusing on filings, motions, orders, and procedural developments under Mahon's oversight.

1. **June 18, 2024:** Request for Assignment of Judge filed by President Judge David L. Ashworth, recommending William P. Mahon with approval of Chief Justice Debra Todd. Mahon assigned, marking the start of his oversight.
2. **August 6, 2024:** Judicial Notice of Appearance by Way of Affidavit filed by Husband (Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich), with Certificate of Service.
3. **August 12, 2024:** Defendant's Petition for Declaratory Judgment by Affidavit filed by Husband.
4. **September 13, 2024:** Order issued scheduling status conference for September 24, 2024.
5. **September 16, 2024:** Order repeated; hearing scheduled for September 24, 2024.
6. **September 17, 2024:** Affidavit of Fact September 2024 filed by Husband.
7. **September 26, 2024:** Master Appointment: Richard J. Gromen appointed as Divorce Master; telephonic status conference scheduled for November 21, 2024.
8. **October 11, 2024:** Order issued prohibiting direct contact with the court by parties and counsel; all communications to be filed of record or oral with both parties. Mail returned for Kristin E. Jaquis, Esq.
9. **October 15, 2024:** Petition for Special Relief Hearing by Affidavit filed by Husband.
10. **October 21, 2024:** Mail returned for order to Husband (moved, no address).
11. **October 28, 2024:** Motion to Reconsider Divorce Bifurcation by Affidavit filed by Husband.
12. **October 29, 2024:** Mail returned for order to Kristin E. Jaquis, Esq.
13. **November 4, 2024:** Memo on Pre-Marital Contract & Counterclaim Breach of Contract filed by Husband, with letter, Certificate of Service, and exhibits.
14. **November 20, 2024:** Order denying Petition for Special Relief: Deemed incomprehensible; request for advisory opinion improper before Master hearing.
15. **November 22, 2024:** Order denying Motion to Reconsider Bifurcation: Previously denied and now law of the case; cannot overrule prior judge without clear error.
16. **December 6, 2024:** Husband's Updated Asset Inventory for November 30, 2019 (as of November 30, 2024) filed (two entries), with Confidential Document Forms.
17. **January 2, 2025:** Affidavit of Probable Cause filed by Husband.
18. **January 15, 2025:** Judicial Notice filed by Husband.
19. **January 30, 2025:** Order denying counterclaim in divorce for breach of contract: Untimely, improperly filed; no basis in marital vows for depriving court of jurisdiction over equitable distribution.
20. **February 3, 2025:** Petition Writ Habeas Corpus Ad Subjiciendum by Affidavit filed by Husband.
21. **February 14, 2025:** Husband's Essentials Only Pre-Trial Statement for Equitable Distribution filed, with Confidential Document Form.
22. **February 20, 2025:** Defendant's Exhibits filed by Husband.
23. **March 20, 2025:** Hearing scheduled for Divorce Officer Pre-Trial Conference on April 23, 2025.
24. **April 9, 2025:** Motions for Appointment of Master and Amended Motion filed by Husband.

25. **April 18, 2025:** Order denying Motion for Divorce Master and Special Relief Hearings: Premature per L.C.R.C.P. 1920.51; await discovery motion on April 26, 2025.
26. **April 22, 2025:** Defendant's Private Criminal Complaint and Complaint Form filed by Husband.
27. **April 29, 2025:** Income & Expense Statement filed by Wife, with Confidential Document Form.
28. **April 30, 2025:** Defendant's Judicial Notice Regarding Improper Venue filed by Husband.
29. **May 1, 2025:** Mail returned for order to Husband.
30. **May 2, 2025:** Defendant's Private Criminal Complaint filed by Husband.
31. **May 16, 2025:** Second Pre-Trial Statement Summary by Affidavit filed by Husband, with Confidential Document Form.
32. **May 29, 2025:** Hearings scheduled: Divorce Officer Pre-Trial Conference for June 5, 2025; Divorce Officer Hearing for August 7, 2025.
33. **August 1, 2025:** Expert Witness Report Business Accounting filed by Husband, with Confidential Document Form.
34. **August 6, 2025:** Judicial Notice of Appearance by Way of Affidavit filed by Husband (duplicate entry noted).
35. **August 12, 2025:** Defendant's Petition for Declaratory Judgment filed by Husband (duplicate).
36. **August 14, 2025:** Exhibits filed by Husband, with Index and Confidential Document Form.
37. **August 15, 2025:** Notice of Electronic Filing generated.
38. **September 11, 2025:** Request for Transcript filed by Wife's attorney Wendy Chan.
39. **October 14, 2025:** Transcript lodged for Divorce Hearing on August 7, 2025, before Richard J. Gromen, Jr.
40. **October 17, 2025:** Motion to Amend the Record After Catastrophic Industrywide Liquidation Event filed by Husband, with Confidential Document Form.
41. **November 19, 2025:** Wife's Post-Master Hearing Brief filed by Wendy Chan, with Certificates, Exhibits, Index, and Confidential Document Form.
42. **November 20, 2025:** Notice of Electronic Filing generated.
43. **November 21, 2025:** Defendant's Brief Regarding Equitable Distribution filed by Husband, with Exhibits and Confidential Document Form.

5. DETAILED CIVIL RIGHTS LAW

a. My First Federal Lawsuit – The 2023 §1983 Action

In this chapter, I detail my initial federal civil rights lawsuit under 42 U.S.C. §1983, filed in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. Initiated on March 15, 2023, as *Reich v. Chan et al.* (Case No. 5:2023cv01066-JMG), the complaint challenged alleged due process violations in Lancaster County family court proceedings. It named defendants including

Wendy Chan and several judges and officials from the Court of Common Pleas and Domestic Relations Section. The case, assigned to Judge John M. Gallagher, proceeded through motions and was ultimately dismissed on July 12, 2023, based on doctrines like Rooker-Feldman and judicial immunity. In hindsight neither Rooker-Feldman nor judicial immunity should have applied. Below is an affidavit summarizing the key facts from the docket.

1. **March 15, 2023**, I filed the original Complaint pro se, alleging violations of my civil rights under color of state law, specifically due process deprivations in Lancaster County family court proceedings. Defendants included Wendy Chan, multiple judges (e.g., Christopher Hackman, Dennis Reinaker, Donald Totaro, Jeffery Reich, Margaret Miller, Leonard Brown III, Thomas B. Sponaugle, Jeffrey Conrad, JoAnne Murphy, Shawn McLaughlin, Todd Brown, Christina Parsons, Edward D. Reibman), court officials (Andrew Spade, Jaquelyn Pfursich, Heather Adams, Christopher Leppler, Daniel Scarberry, Joshua Parson, Ray D'Agostino, Craig Lehman, Nicky Woods, Alice Yoder), and Gary Kline from Domestic Relations.
2. The Complaint detailed how defendants conspired to issue ex parte orders, deny hearings, impose asymmetric custody, and enforce fraudulent support without Mathews v. Eldridge balancing or evidence of unfitness, constituting a §1983 conspiracy to deprive Fourteenth Amendment rights.
3. **March 16, 2023**, the case was assigned to Judge John M. Gallagher.
4. Summons were issued on March 20, 2023, and served upon defendants in subsequent weeks.
5. Between **April and May 2023**, multiple defendants filed Motions to Dismiss under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6), arguing lack of subject matter jurisdiction (Rooker-Feldman, Younger abstention), judicial immunity, failure to state a claim, and that private actors like Chan weren't state actors.
6. I filed responses opposing the motions, reiterating the constitutional harms and arguing that the actions were ultra vires, thus stripping immunity.
7. **July 12, 2023**, Judge Gallagher issued a Memorandum Opinion and Order granting the motions to dismiss. The court held: (a) Rooker-Feldman barred review of state court judgments; (b) Younger abstention applied to ongoing proceedings; (c) judicial defendants enjoyed absolute immunity for acts within jurisdiction; (d) non-judicial defendants weren't state actors or failed to meet conspiracy thresholds; (e) the Complaint failed to plausibly allege violations under Iqbal/Twombly standards. The case was dismissed without prejudice, allowing potential refiling.

b. HABEAS CORPUS AT THE LANCASTER CCP

Introduction to CI-25-00735: A Civil Rights Case, Not Domestic Relations

CI-25-00735 is fundamentally a civil rights action disguised as a family law matter, challenging systemic violations of constitutional rights under color of law. Unlike typical domestic relations cases focused on custody or support, this petition for writ of habeas corpus targets official misconduct, including due process denials, equal protection breaches, and conspiracy against

rights. It invokes federal supremacy to nullify state actions that infringe on parental liberties, treating the underlying family disputes as symptoms of broader governmental overreach. This framing shifts the case from state family court jurisdiction to federal civil rights scrutiny, emphasizing 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims for deprivations rather than routine domestic resolutions.

Affidavit of Fact: Habeas Corpus Proceedings (CI-25-00735)

1. **February 3, 2025:** Blair Jesse Ellyn: Reich filed Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Subjiciendum by Affidavit, ex parte, against Court of Common Pleas Lancaster County Pennsylvania Officials (Debra Todd et al.), initiating the case as CI-25-00735.
2. **February 14, 2025:** Judicial Notice of Dereliction of Duty and Treason filed by Plaintiff, pro se, with Certificate of Service.
3. **February 20, 2025:** Private Criminal Complaint filed by Plaintiff, pro se.
4. **March 26, 2025:** Request for Assignment of Judge approved by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts; case reassigned to Edward D. Reibman, Senior Judge Specially Presiding.
5. **July 1, 2025:** Order scheduling Status Conference for August 8, 2025.
6. **July 3, 2025:** Hearing scheduled for Status Conference on August 8, 2025.
7. **July 24, 2025:** Praecipe for Entry of Appearance by David J. MacMain on behalf of Defendants: Prothonotary Andrew E. Spade, District Attorney Heather Adams, Chief County Detective Kent Switzer, Sheriff Christopher Leppler, Commissioner Alice Yoder, Commissioner Joshua Parsons, Commissioner Ray D'Agostino, Director Gary Kline, and Solicitor Jacqueline Pfursich.
8. **July 29, 2025:** Judicial Notice of Capital Crimes by Defendants filed by Plaintiff, pro se, with Certificate of Service.
9. **August 5, 2025:** Praecipe for Entry of Appearance by David J. MacMain (additional or duplicate filing for same defendants).
10. **August 11, 2025:** Order following Status Conference on August 8, 2025, attended by Plaintiff pro se, David J. MacMain, and Sonya Kivisto; schedules Oral Argument for November 18, 2025.
11. **September 12, 2025:** Amended Complaint filed by Plaintiff, pro se.
 - a. **Biblical Violations Section:** Argues order contravenes divine law per Federal Public Law 97-280 (Bible as Word of God guiding nation); violations of parental authority (Ephesians 6:4, Colossians 3:21, Proverbs 22:6), family unity (Genesis 2:24, Psalm 127:3-5), due process/justice (Deuteronomy 16:18-20, Amos 5:24, Matthew 7:1-2), and prohibition against oppression (Exodus 22:22-24, Romans 13:3-4, 1 Samuel 8:10-18).
 - b. **Legal Argument Section:** Order void ab initio per United States v. Throckmorton (fraudulent judgments); vacatur warranted under Pa.R.C.P. 1915.10, FRCP 60(b)(4)/(6), 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (All Writs Act). Constitutes RICO under 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c); predicate acts include 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1343, 1346, 1951, 1962, 1589–1593. Chevron overturned in Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo; heightened scrutiny required per Quilloin v. Walcott.

- c. **Constitutional Violations:** 14th Amendment due process/substantive due process (*Mathews v. Eldridge*, *Cleveland Bd. of Education v. Loudermill*); equal protection (*Doe v. Purdue University*); 5th Amendment takings (*Boddie v. Connecticut*); Supremacy Clause (*Hanna v. Plumer*); 1st Amendment petition (*Bounds v. Smith*, *Tennessee v. Lane*).
 - d. **USC Violations:** 42 U.S.C. § 654, § 666; 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (*Monell*); 28 U.S.C. § 1738B; 15 U.S.C. §§ 1681e(b), 1681m; 28 U.S.C. §§ 2071–2072; 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729–3733.
 - e. **Case Law Violations:** Parental rights (*Santosky v. Kramer*, *Quilloin v. Walcott*, *Troxel v. Granville*, *Stanley v. Illinois*); due process (*Mathews v. Eldridge*, *Hovey v. Elliott*, *Cleveland Bd. of Education v. Loudermill*); void judgments (*United States v. Throckmorton*, *Plaut v. Spendthrift Farm*); pro se rights (*Haines v. Kerner*); access to courts (*Christopher v. Harbury*, *Ryland v. Shapiro*); RICO (*Sedima v. Imrex*, *H.J. Inc. v. Northwestern Bell*, *Reves v. Ernst & Young*); spoliation (*Zubulake v. UBS Warburg*, *Silvestri v. General Motors*, *Pension Committee v. Banc of America*); immunity/abstention (*Younger v. Harris*, *Pulliam v. Allen*, *Smith v. Barry*).
 - f. **Regulatory Violations:** 45 CFR §§ 302–308, § 303.101, § 303.8, § 302.56, § 303.100.
 - g. **Court Rule Violations:** Pa.R.C.P. 1915.10, 227.1; FRCP 60(b), 5.1, 83(a)(2), 11(b), 26, 34, 37(e), 38 (Pa.R.C.P. 1007.1 equivalent).
 - h. **Interstate Contractual Failure:** Violations of Cooperative Agreement between PA DHS, Lancaster County, CCP, DRS under Title IV-D (42 U.S.C. § 654, 45 CFR Part 302); breaches federal supremacy (*Cooper v. Aaron*) and contractual terms.
12. **September 12, 2025:** Notice of Service filed by Plaintiff, pro se.
 13. **September 25, 2025:** Preliminary Objections by Moving Defendants (County Defendants) filed by David J. MacMain, with Brief in Support, Certificate of Service, and Proposed Order (pages 16-255 electronic PDF).
 14. **September 26, 2025:** Praecipe for Entry of Appearance by Sonya Kivisto on behalf of Judicial Defendants (Chief Justice Debra Todd, Hon. William P. Mahon, Hon. David Ashworth, Hon. Merrill Spahn, Jr., Hon. Craig Stedman, Hon. David Workman, Hon. Christopher Hackman, Hon. Leonard Brown III, Hon. Dennis E. Reinaker, Hon. Jeffery D. Wright, Hon. Margaret C. Miller, Hon. Jeffrey A. Conrad, Hon. Joanne Murphy, Hon. Shawn P. McLaughlin, Hon. Donald Totaro, Hon. Howard Knisely, Hon. Jeffery Wright, Hon. Todd Brown, Hon. Christina Parsons) and Gary Kline in his official capacity.
 15. **September 26, 2025:** Preliminary Objections by Judicial Defendants and Gary Kline filed by Sonya Kivisto, with Brief in Support and Certificate of Compliance.
 16. **October 23, 2025:** Response to Preliminary Objections filed by Plaintiff, pro se.
 17. **November 21, 2025:** Judicial Notice of Cooperative Agreement & "Affirmation of Federal Supremacy" filed by Plaintiff, pro se, with Certificate of Service.
 18. **December 4, 2025:** Notice and Demand for Expeditious Hearing on Motions to Dismiss filed by Plaintiff, pro se, with Certificate of Service.

19. **December 11, 2025:** Memorandum Opinion filed by Edward D. Reibman, Senior Judge Specially Presiding.
20. **December 11, 2025:** Order dismissing Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus with prejudice, granting preliminary objections, filed by Edward D. Reibman. Copies sent to parties.

i.

CHILD SUPPORT STARTED STARTED LAWFULLY

Child support laws in the United States, as we know them today, trace their modern roots to the social and economic upheavals of the 1960s and 1970s. During this era, rising divorce rates and single-parent households—often headed by mothers—placed increasing strain on public welfare systems. Programs like Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), established under the Social Security Act of 1935 and expanded in the 1960s as part of President Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society initiatives, provided financial assistance to low-income families. However, these benefits came at a cost to taxpayers, and policymakers identified a key culprit: absent parents, particularly fathers, who failed to fulfill their financial obligations.

The legal framework was built on a straightforward principle of accountability. Under common law and state statutes, parents had a fundamental duty to support their children—a responsibility that did not dissolve with marital separation. When a mother turned to welfare due to a father's non-support, the government stepped in as a surrogate provider, incurring damages in the form of public expenditures. To recoup these costs and deter "deadbeat" behavior, Congress passed the Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1975 (Title IV-D of the Social Security Act). This legislation created the federal Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) and required states to establish enforcement programs, prioritizing cases where families received AFDC. States were empowered to locate absent parents, establish paternity, and collect payments through wage garnishment, tax refund intercepts, and liens—tools designed to hold breaching parents liable without overburdening the courts.

At its inception, this system represented a reasonable and just endeavor: it aimed to enforce parental duty, reduce welfare dependency, and protect vulnerable children from poverty. By the 1980s, further reforms like the Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1984 and the Family Support Act of 1988 strengthened these mechanisms, mandating automatic withholding and uniform guidelines. The focus was restorative—recovering public funds while ensuring private family support—rather than punitive. Yet, as we'll explore later, this once-pragmatic structure has devolved into a complex, interstate bureaucracy intentionally depriving Fathers of Due Process, Fairness, and Justice rights and then subsequently depriving them of their fundamental liberties to acquire, possess, and protect property as well as depriving them of the care, custody, and control of their children. The modern version of child support, especially as enacted by treasonous despots in municipal courts, is far removed from its original intent of balancing accountability with fairness.

The Predatory Devolution of Child Support: A State-Sponsored War on Fathers and Constitutional Rights

What began as an ostensibly noble effort to hold absentee parents accountable has mutated into a draconian, profit-driven machine that systematically targets fathers, strips them of their

earnings, and tramples constitutional safeguards under the boot of administrative overreach. Since the Family Support Act of 1988—which mandated uniform guidelines and automatic withholding to "strengthen" enforcement—the system has devolved into a predatory bureaucracy that prioritizes revenue generation over family stability, often leaving fathers destitute, incarcerated, and alienated from their children. This isn't justice; it's a malicious assault on Due Process, property rights, and parental bonds, weaponized by state courts and federal mandates that treat men as walking ATMs while ignoring their humanity.

Post-1988 laws have escalated this assault with ruthless efficiency. The Child Support Recovery Act of 1992 federalized non-payment as a misdemeanor, paving the way for interstate hunts for "deadbeats," while the Deadbeat Parents Punishment Act of 1998 upped the ante to felonies, complete with prison terms up to two years for arrears over \$5,000—without regard for economic hardship or inability to pay. These statutes, amplified by the Bradley Amendment of 1986 (enforced more aggressively post-1988), prohibit retroactive modifications, trapping fathers in inescapable debt spirals even if job loss or illness strikes. Critics rightly decry this as a modern debtor's prison, violating the 14th Amendment's due process clause by imposing punishment without fair hearings or jury trials. State courts, acting as administrative enforcers, wield tools like wage garnishment (up to 65% of income), license suspensions, and asset seizures—measures that don't just collect debt but destroy livelihoods, pushing fathers into poverty and further non-compliance.

The malice is evident in how courts target fathers with blatant bias violating the Federal tenet of Equal Protection. Guidelines treat men as financial providers first, humans second, often imputing inflated incomes based on "earning potential" rather than reality, leading to crushing obligations that ignore shared custody or economic downturns. In Pennsylvania, for instance, judges rigidly apply "guidelines" as unbreakable rules, disregarding fathers' actual circumstances and fueling myths that paint all non-payers as deadbeats. This administrative law nightmare bypasses traditional courts, allowing unelected bureaucrats to levy "support" as de facto taxes without adversarial process, violating equal protection by disproportionately burdening men—15% of custodial parents are now fathers, yet mothers in those roles pay even less reliably without facing equivalent enforcement. The result? Fathers disengage, relationships fracture, and children suffer the very poverty the system claims to prevent.

Unconstitutionally, this regime revives banned practices like debtor's prisons, jailing fathers for civil contempt without proving willfulness, as in *Turner v. Rogers* (2011), where the Supreme Court warned of due process violations but failed to dismantle the system. States seize property—bank accounts, tax refunds, even passports—without jury trials, flouting the 5th and 14th Amendments' takings clauses. Federal incentives reward aggressive collection, turning enforcement into a revenue stream that preys on low-income dads, creating cycles of incarceration and unemployment that mock any notion of fairness. It's not support—it's extortion, an unconstitutional war on fathers disguised as child welfare, demanding radical reform to restore justice over greed.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATION OF FEDERAL SUPREMACY

You are bound by:

28 U.S.C. § 453 – Judicial oath to uphold the Constitution

Article VI, Clause 2 – Supreme Law of the Land

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT Section 9: Affirmation of Federal Supremacy

Gorsuch Precedents – All lower courts must obey SCOTUS judgments

DELIBERATE FEDERAL SUPREMACY CIRCUMVENTION BY DEPRIVATION OF FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS, JUSTICE, DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION FIRST FOLLOWED BY DEPRIVATION OF PROPERTY AND PARENTAL LIBERTIES SECOND

The cartel is bound by Federal Supremacy, but the operations are more like despots and tyrants than lawful adjudicators. State Court Judges enact treason daily as the cartel effectuates its unlawful enterprise first by depriving litigants of their 14th amendment rights to Fundamental Fairness, Justice, Due Process of Law and Equal Protection of Law and then subsequently violates the fundamental liberty interests of litigants as parents and property owners.

The primary objective of the cartel is to launder interstate federal funding from Title IV-D of the Social Security Act by way of placing oppressive orders on primary breadwinners trapped in family law, of which the vast majority are fathers. This intentional deprivation of Fourteenth Amendment rights, especially equal protection — achieved by issuing deliberately burdensome, unconstitutional divorce, custody, and support orders that target fathers for wealth extraction and child trafficking under the guise of Title IV-D incentives — constitutes an open war against the United States Constitution itself and justifies declaring the existence and continued operation of the Black Collar Cartel as levying war against the Constitution, i.e., treason.

These conditions are not an error of law, but acts of commission hidden under covert omission. The COOPERATION AGREEMENT, which outlines part of the diabolically and elaborately nested scheme living inside federal and state law, federal regulations, a variety of secretive interstate and intergovernmental contracts, third party agent/agency contracts, and employment agreements, is signed by multiple Lancaster parties and the contract expressly states “AFFIRMATION OF FEDERAL SUPREMACY.” Yet in Reich v Reich matters they have deliberately ignored that signed affirmation on every single docket entry for five years. They literally argue State Courts are not bound by “Convoluting Federal Supremacy.” That is not negligence; It’s madness. Mahon has intentionally breached a written contract with the United

States and a fundamental tenet of the entire judicial branch of government. This isn't an oversight; it's sedition against the Constitution they swore to uphold, and prima facie evidence of the racketeering enterprise operating behind the veneer.

Despite the Constitutionally required Federal Supremacy as well as contractually affirmed Federal Supremacy the agreement incentivizes, inter alia, issuance of support orders and capturing arrears and there are no incentives for lawfully adjudicating matters by way of Federal Supremacy. The Agreement says one thing, but rewards something different. The cartel is constitutionally and contractually required to Affirm Federal Supremacy, but they choose not to affirm it, and further the diabolically engineered system financially incentivizes participants to ignore Federal Supremacy. One error could be held in the highest possible amount of Grace to be an accident, but two separate failures of pledged Affirmation of Federal Supremacy demonstrate ***Mens Rea***.

Thus, the cartel interacts with all three matters of family law to effectuate the scheme. Divorce matters keep the target captive in the simulation of law. Custody matters provide the cartel an opportunity to issue asymmetric custody orders, which under statutory guidelines allow for larger support orders. Support matters are oppressive and intentionally designed to siphon money from fathers and then launder interstate Title IV-D funding. So, the combination of the three matters is to keep fathers inside the illegal operation as long as possible, to take their property, income, and savings with asymmetric custody orders intensifying the theft, and then laundering interstate capture of Title IV-D Funds. The result is predictable irreparable harm to fathers and families and an extensive crime spree against fathers trapped in the simulation of law.

So, within that larger context of a criminal cartel depriving him of his fundamental liberties first and parental, property, speech, and religious rights second; Defendant notes several key omissions, deficiencies, and irregularities by this alleged court while unlawfully administering this equitable distribution and related divorce matters-

DELIBERATE FAILURE OF FEDERAL SUPREMACY

The Court intentionally and deliberately violated Constitutional requirements under Federal Supremacy. The Court routinely deprives me, and similarly situated litigants, of my 14th Amendment protections to Fundamental Fairness expressed as:

- Neutral Arbitration
- Statutory Compliance
- Due Notice
- Substantive and Procedural Due Process of Law
- Equal Protection

It does so while notified of the omitted conditions and the court is deliberately indifferent to those conditions and these concerns expressed by Defendant.

UNDER FEDERAL SUPREMACY LITIGANTS GENERALLY AND FATHERS SPECIFICALLY ARE DUE FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS (DOs)

State court, when operating lawfully, is under Federal Supremacy and thus I am due the following constitutional considerations-

- Fundamental Fairness and Justice under the 14th amendment in combination with other amendments as well as case law defining fundamental liberties such as incorporation doctrine cases
 - Neutral Arbitration
 - Statutory Compliance
 - Due Notice
 - Meaningful Hearing at a Meaningful Time
 - Pre-Deprivation hearings
 - Due Process of Law
 - Substantive Rights
 - A spectrum of fundamental rights that require special consideration and protection when being abridged by the state under *Parens Patriae* or Police Powers.
 - Fundamental right to Justice
 - Care, Custody, and Control of Children
 - Acquire, Possess, and Protect Property
 - When Substantive Rights are involved procedural safeguards are required. It's legal to abridge your rights, but only in consideration of constitutional safeguards in the form of procedural steps
 - Procedural Safeguards
 - Presumptions
 - Parental Fitness and special weight
 - State Interest
 - *Di minimus* when Fit Parents involved
 - Burden of Proof
 - Standard of Proof
 - Evidence Standards
 - Strict Scrutiny
 - Narrowly tailored
 - Compelling state interest
 - Least restrictive means
 - Equal Protection under the Law
 - Prohibition of Invidious Discrimination
 - As Applied
 - Facial

To be clear, The COURT OF COMMON PLEAS LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA generally, and these legal matters specifically are intentionally devoid of the above Constitutional Considerations. US and State Constitutions inhibit cartel operations via intentional deprivation of constitutional rights; thus they're unlawfully circumvented. That's treason and sedition.

UNDER THE 14TH AMENDMENT THE COURT IS BARRED FROM UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONDITIONS, OVERREACH, & OMISSIONS (DON'T'S)

In the above Part I describe what is due by the court system under Federal Supremacy. Similarly, the 14th Amendment also bars this court from certain actions under various aspects of the Incorporation Doctrine such as:

- Overbroad Actions
- Unconstitutional Conditions
- Takings Clause Violations
- Excessive Fines or Forfeitures
- Failure to Protect
- Retaliation for Exercising Constitutional Rights
- Vague language in rules, laws, statutes, and regulations (Void for Vagueness)
- Deliberate Indifference
- Municipal Failure
- State Created Dangers
- Commerce Clause violations
- Denying access to courts
- Failure to disclose commercial presumptions
- Committing Crimes [Obstruction, Evidence Tampering, intentional clerical errors]

These Cartel Courts routinely employ the various *restrictions* provided above. The Court is depriving me, and those similarly situated, of the Constitutional Safeguards due to him and simultaneously deliberately acting in excess of their constitutional authority imposed by constitutional restrictions. The two sections above are like the "DOs and DON'Ts" of Federal Supremacy, and this cartel court routinely DON'Ts the DOs and DOs the DON'Ts. Again, these are not errors of law. The officials are judges and understand these concepts and the court has been notified of their failures and transgressions while it continues to operate in the same manner.

FAILURE BY OMISSION

And like a kid in school we do some word matching. See how many of the terms from the above list of terms under Federal Supremacy you're able to find in orders in the Appendix. The overlap of words from the list of constitutional prerequisites for lawful orders and the words in these previous family law orders is **zero**. That's not an oversight. That's institutionalized

treason by the municipal judiciary acting like a coordinated cartel rather than lawful adjudicators of Article III and VI justice.

NOTE THE DEVIOUS NATURE

The cartel operates by depriving litigants of rights they don't even know they have. You might know you have freedom of speech and religion. Did you know what rights you have in court under Federal Supremacy? It's a lot easier to discover and catch something that they're actively doing that's illegal rather than something they are intentionally **omitting**. Unless you've spent years in court and have read thousands of pages covering hundreds of years of Supreme Court Case Law you can't explain the crimes that are happening because you don't even know what they're intentionally depriving. Do you think that's an accident?

PSYCHOPATHS WHO ENGAGE THE CARTEL

Mothers who aggressively engage with the Black Collared Cartel to enforce more atrocious things happening to you are complicit in the system. They're engaging a literal cartel/crime syndicate to cause fathers harm to benefit her and it. Conspiring with a criminal cartel is illegal. I have decided to remember this now that I'm done being a punching bag spitting out money.

WHAT JUDGES AND CARTEL MEMBERS SAY WHEN MENTIONING THE CRIMINALITY

The most likely first thing they'll say is a toothless ad hominem "Looks like we got us a Saaavvvvrrrrriiiiiinnnn Citzzzzzzeeeeeeennnnn." Mahon in particular has stated it multiple times.

That's right, if I say "I have rights and you can't abridge them without a series of constitutional prerequisites and safeguards in place" they'll inevitably call me a "Sovereign citizen." They call me an "extremist" who they consider "dangerous," and they even demand I undergo a SECOND psychological evaluation to prove I'm not some crazy person hosting such wacko ideas as "I have rights." As I continue pushing they'll talk about my repeated "frivolous" arguments. What kind of legal idiot claims they have rights in court before a judge?!? They use contempt and threat of contempt with jail time as another method to chill the notion I have constitutional rights.

This judicial cartel has friends in other parts of the judiciary and when I file complaints I get things back like "we've investigated ourselves and found no wrongdoing." I can also expect this classic line "lacks prosecutorial merit." That's because the people that are supposed to be watching out for rampant interconnected, interstate criminal cartels made up of judges and elected/appointed officials are all part of the interstate cartel.

My deeply uncomfortable explanation- The whole thing is compromised.

Even all this is Nested in the context of larger constitutional problems

Problems that regular litigants are facing in Family Law courts aren't isolated issues. The problem is judicially engineered layers of nested problems. Each unlawful experience in family

law court is part of a larger and deeper nested series of constitutional problems diabolically engineered by the judiciary.

Everywhere I go in law I find that the illegal and unlawful experience is housed in other larger problems. The unfair custody order and restraining orders are the start of asymmetric custody, which by state law and interstate contractual agreements allow them to increase the amount of support. The support order is intentionally oppressive to maximize federal funding. The unlawful freezes and seizures of your money if you don't pay or have arrears aren't constitutional either. The divorce matter keeps you bound to the other two while draining finances and leading to an inability for self defense. When I start complaining there's a new layer of compromised people responding. This massive judicial cartel expands vertically through the court hierarchy and horizontally through ALL the different American geographies (like different municipal court systems).

There are structural problems in the judiciary, specifically it's been infiltrated by a black collar cartel, and they have engineered the court system away from constitutional adjudication to an unlawful simulation of law where I am treasonously deprived of rights as a starting point of the experience. The judges doing this aren't stupid. They're diabolically brilliant. It looks clean from lots of directions. The scheme covers itself from attacks, and the only way to really figure out what's going on is to be an outsider who has learned the system so well by reviewing hundreds of years of Supreme Court case law to figure out what's **missing**.

ACTS OF COMMISSION DISGUISED AS COVERT ACTS OF OMISSION

What makes this cartel so effective is that the entire scheme rests on what they don't do as opposed to what they do do. They're supposed to protect rights in court, but instead they're the ones actively depriving them. They're supposed to intervene at times in the court process if the other side is completely and blatantly breaking the rules. Instead, the Black Collar Cartel is ensuring father's rights are removed from the court process and helping wives along the way with little things like not admitting evidence, allowing 500 page ambushes the day of trial, and letting counsel lead witnesses.

Back in the day you could be a half illiterate, non-english speaking immigrant and slap down some poorly written English and the judges faithful to the law would generously interpret your words to form some kind of complaint or response. The discipline of law was not meant just for powerful elites and people with million dollar law degrees. It's not like that anymore.

The only shot of making any real headway in court is by mastering state statutes and court process so well that you can drive black letter law backed by years of case law into judges like a wooden spike through a vampire. The system is highly oppressive, but does allow limited relief from oppressive orders for some pro se litigants that are exceptionally knowledgeable, diligently on top of their legal matters, and perform well under pressure while not spouting out patriot mythology.

The cartel is an extensive network and goes beyond municipal judges. It appears to have captured other agencies in the judiciary, appellate courts, some federal judges, and contractors like support/divorce/custody conference officers, people like the accounting nerds that work for your local DRS, and those operating their portion of this scheme in the state and federal agencies. State and Federal Clerks have come to believe their duties are judicial rather than ministerial and routinely block access to the Courts.

Title IV-D funds are in the billions of dollars annually. Is it that hard to think that a group of devious people would manipulate that for unlawful personal gain? If it's judges doing the crime is it that hard to believe that they covered their asses with an interlocked nested series of hard to get secretive contracts and gigantic volumes of hard to read and hard to digest federal laws and regulations?

Family law is devoid of justice. The reason that it's such an atrocious experience is that it's operated by a Black Collar Criminal Cartel made of the judiciary and elected/appointed officials in the county who are illegally laundering, stealing, and wire frauding their way to billions of Title IV-D monies. I have been human trafficked and my kids have been put through this racketeering enterprise with the help of my wife who is cashing in with her attorney while wilfully complicit with the cartel. The whole thing reeks of treason and sedition. Title IV-D funding is the root of the judicial cartel and it spreads from there.

CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS RAISED

This letter raises critical constitutional questions stemming from the Lancaster County Court of Common Pleas' entrenched pattern of misconduct in family law proceedings, where deliberate omissions of procedural safeguards, biased enforcement driven by Title IV-D incentives under Title IV-D of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. § 651 et seq.), and willful defiance of federal mandates have systematically stripped litigants of their fundamental rights, perpetuating a regime of injustice that demands rigorous appellate scrutiny to dismantle these abuses and enforce the supremacy of the Constitution over corrupt state practices.

CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Lancaster County Court of Common Pleas and associated Domestic Relations Section's systematic deprivation of pre-deprivation hearings, neutral arbitration, and meaningful notice in child support and custody proceedings violates the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, as established in *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976), and *Cleveland Board of Education v. Loudermill*, 470 U.S. 532 (1985), where such omissions facilitate the extraction of property and parental liberties without fundamental fairness or procedural safeguards.
2. Whether the imposition of asymmetric custody and support orders, disproportionately burdening fathers to maximize federal reimbursements under Title IV-D of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. § 651 et seq.), constitutes invidious gender-based discrimination in violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, as articulated in *Doe v. Purdue University*, 928 F.3d 652 (7th Cir. 2019), and *Village of Willowbrook v. Olech*, 528 U.S. 562 (2000), resulting in unequal treatment of similarly situated litigants without a compelling state interest.
3. Whether state courts' deliberate circumvention of Supreme Court precedents on parental rights—such as *Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57 (2000), and *Santosky v. Kramer*, 455 U.S. 745 (1982)—by issuing orders that sever parental bonds without strict scrutiny or evidence of unfitness, infringes upon the substantive due process protections of the Fourteenth Amendment and the fundamental liberty interest in the care, custody, and control of one's children.
4. Whether the enforcement of child support obligations through ex parte seizures of income, assets, and tax refunds, without regard to ability to pay or retroactive modification, effects an unconstitutional taking of property under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, as prohibited by *Boddie v. Connecticut*, 401 U.S. 371 (1971), and constitutes involuntary servitude in violation of the Thirteenth Amendment, where such actions coerce labor under threat of incarceration, per *Turner v. Rogers*, 564 U.S. 431 (2011).
5. Whether the state judiciary's refusal to adhere to federally mandated procedural requirements under Title IV-D regulations (45 C.F.R. §§ 302-308), including affirmation of federal supremacy in cooperative agreements, contravenes the Supremacy Clause of Article VI of the United States Constitution, as reaffirmed in *Cooper v. Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1

(1958), thereby rendering void ab initio all orders issued in defiance of federal law and precedents.

6. Whether the pattern of judicial indifference to notified constitutional deprivations—evidenced by denials of recusal motions, strikes of filings, and continuances favoring one party—amounts to a conspiracy to deprive rights under color of law, violating the First Amendment's Petition Clause and the Fourteenth Amendment's guarantees of access to courts and equal protection, as protected by *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. 817 (1977), and *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972).
7. Whether the retaliatory denial of pro se filings, imposition of sanctions, and suppression of grievances in response to constitutional challenges constitutes retaliation in violation of the First Amendment, as established in *Hartman v. Moore*, 547 U.S. 250 (2006), thereby chilling protected speech and the right to petition for redress of grievances.
8. Whether the imposition of economically destructive child support levies, punitive incarcerations, and excessive fines without proportionality or regard for indigency violates the Eighth Amendment's prohibitions on excessive fines and cruel and unusual punishment, as interpreted in *Timbs v. Indiana*, 586 U.S. 146 (2019), and *United States v. Bajakajian*, 524 U.S. 321 (1998), where such measures serve primarily to generate Title IV-D revenue rather than support children.
9. Whether the Lancaster County judiciary's systemic disregard for Pennsylvania state court rules (e.g., Pa.R.C.P. 1901.5, 1915.4, and 1920.51 requiring prompt hearings, notices, and fair processes in family matters), state regulations, and case law—coupled with obstruction of access to public records under the Pennsylvania Right-to-Know Law (65 P.S. § 67.101 et seq.)—violates Article I, §§ 1, 11, and 26 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, denying inherent rights, open courts, remedies by due course of law without delay or denial, and equal protection without discrimination, thereby compounding federal constitutional harms through state-level procedural abuses.

KNOWINGLY FLAWED ARGUMENTS PRESENTED BY TREASONOUS DESPOT SENIOR RETIRED JUDGE WILLIAM P MAHON -

November 6, 2025, "Motion for continuance, judicial notice of treasonous Racketeering Enterprise, Judicial Notice of Contractual "Affirmation of Federal Supremacy"" is **DENIED**.

Footnote 1: Defendant Misconstrues the significance of the attached Somerset Count grant award agreement (COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT) allowing it to administer social security funding to aid minors in receiving federal benefits. Defendant fails to acknowledge the following agreement language **which negates any convoluted federal supremacy** argument presented:

Section 1.2. This agreement is not intended to, nor does it in any way, enlarge or reduce the jurisdiction of the Court, nor is it intended to, nor does it, in any manner, encroach upon the independence of the judiciary and determination of the issues of any case in the court.

The remainder of Defendant's incomprehensible arguments are dismissed as meritless and another example of his litigation violence directed against Plaintiff and the Courts.

Mahon puts pen to paper to declare that the Affirmation of Federal Supremacy is meaningless compared to section 1.2 the COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT wherein the Affirmation neither enlarges nor encroaches on the judiciary. Section 1.2 is true and correct, but does not mean what Mahon is stating in bad faith. The Constitution circumscribes State Court Judge authority whether or not the interstate contract is in place. Section 1.2 does not override the constitution, the Supreme Law of the Land. Section 1.2 only denotes the obvious, that the contract cannot interfere with Laws to which the section and contract are subservient.

Mahon and the State Courts intentionally flip the hierarchy upside down. Instead of practicing law where Federal Supremacy is on top they instead treat their cartel fiefdom as on top, and it's frankly unbelievable that a State Court Judge with 25 years of experience on the bench would EXPRESS IN WRITING that an interstate contract has more authority than the US Constitution. It's an idiotic statement, idiotic to leave it in writing, and idiotic for anyone to attempt to protect the position. He's also doing it as the personally appointed agent of Debra Todd, chief justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. Mahon has accused me of needing a psychological evaluation, but I think he'd be better served getting on himself.

August 27, 2025 -"Plaintiff's Motion to Recuse the undersigned is HEREBY DENIED."

Footnote 1: ... Defendant was informed [that] his views are those of a "sovereign citizen."
"Having served on the bench for over 25 years and having been named previously as a judicial defendant, plaintiff's actions have no impact on the undersigned because of the application of judicial immunity."

I've been criminally and judicially complaining about Mahon non-stop after I realized he was the single worst offender of all the judges I'd come across. This is standard practice in State Court. Mock with Ad Hominems, call constitutional arguments frivolous, and refuse his obligations. He deprived me of rights on purpose, did it even when presented with notice, and states over and over again that he's some version of unimpacted or "indifferent." This isn't a virtue. It's literally a Due Process violation that he repeats ad nauseam that he proudly commits.

Lastly, he openly declares that his plan rests on judicial immunity. What he actually means is that he's expecting the entire judicial brotherhood to unlawfully apply good faith judicial immunity against him for bad faith criminal behavior stemming from purposeful deprivation of rights to fairness, justice, and equal protection. There is no judicial immunity for crime. There's no judicial immunity for obstruction and conspiracy. This ends poorly for the cartel.

KNOWINGLY FLAWED ARGUMENTS PRESENTED BY TREASONOUS DESPOT SENIOR JUDGE EDWARD D. REIBMAN -

December 10/11, 2025, "IT IS ORDERED said objections are Granted and Petitioner/Plaintiff's Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is Dismissed with prejudice."

Affiant was denied Due Process when there was no scheduling order for a hearing issued and yet counsel for defendants were present.

Further, the memorandum opinion issued December 11 2025 specifically states "Petitioner/Plaintiff's claims pertain to decisions made in his custody and/or support cases, and those claims can only be raised within those matters."

This is incredibly disingenuous as the entire claim is that the unlawful nature of the matters give rise to a civil rights action which supersedes the family law matters in question. The claims do not pertain to decisions made in custody and support cases. The claims pertain to civil rights matters that spring from intentional deprivation of rights, due process violations, and intentional asymmetric application of law.

The damage is more severe and insane because this is a Habeas Corpus matter. He's doing procedural tricks and disingenuous orders in a Habeas Complaint. That's insane! It's another form of Treason and against every rational principle of law.

JUDICIAL IMMUNITY: GAVEL ATTACHED (NOT THE ROBE)

In the grand theater of justice, judges don their black robes like actors slipping into costume, stepping onto the bench to wield the gavel as their prop of authority. But here's the plot twist many forget: judicial immunity isn't a magical shield sewn into that robe, protecting them from all consequences no matter what they do. No, it's far more limited—tied strictly to legitimate judicial acts, those careful, reasoned swings of the gavel within the bounds of law. Precisely limited to acts within their curtailed jurisdiction as circumscribed by Federal and State Hierarchies of Law. The order must be lawful under the US Constitution, USC, CFR, Case Law precedents, and court rules. Conspiring judges act like all swings regardless of their lawfulness are allowed, but gavel swings supporting crimes are forbidden and unlawful. Any order must be lawful under State Constitution, state code, state regs, state case law, and state and local court rules. Any order has to be lawful under the US Constitution, US Code, Federal Regulation, Federal case law, and federal court rules. In a commercial setting the ruling must follow the UCC guidelines that are housed in specific state statutes (Title 13 in Pennsylvania).

When a judge steps outside those frameworks—engaging in criminal behavior, like corruption, fraud, or even violence—the robe offers no cover. The judge becomes just another citizen, liable for their misdeeds. This chapter explores the myth of blanket judicial immunity, drawing from ancient texts like the Bible to modern rulings, to show that no one, not even a robed figure on high, is above the law. We'll see how history and case law strip away the illusion, culminating in a recent federal case where a judge learned the hard way that neither her robe nor her unlawfully swung gavel granted a free pass committing crimes.

Biblical Foundations: No Immunity for the Wicked Ruler

Long before modern courts, the Bible laid out clear principles on authority, justice, and accountability, emphasizing that rulers—including those who judge—are not exempt from divine law. Scripture repeatedly warns against corrupt leaders who abuse power, making it clear that immunity isn't a divine right but a conditional trust. Judges who pervert justice face severe consequences, as their role is to reflect God's fairness, not to act as untouchable tyrants.

The Bible doesn't mince words: leaders must judge rightly, or they answer to a higher court. For instance, Deuteronomy 16:18-20 commands: "Appoint judges and officials for each of your tribes in every town the Lord your God is giving you, and they shall judge the people fairly. Do not pervert justice or show partiality. Do not accept a bribe, for a bribe blinds the eyes of the wise and twists the words of the innocent. Follow justice and justice alone, so that you may live and possess the land the Lord your God is giving you." Here, judges are servants of justice, not immune overlords. Perverting it—through bias, bribes, or unfair rulings—invites Judgment, not protection.

Exodus 23:6-8 echoes this: "Do not deny justice to your poor people in their lawsuits. Have nothing to do with a false charge and do not put an innocent or honest person to death, for I will not acquit the guilty. Do not accept a bribe, for a bribe blinds those who see and twists the words of the innocent." The message is stark: judicial misconduct, like accepting "bribes" (which could include systemic incentives or favoritism), blinds justice and leads to guilt. No robe shields the guilty—God himself won't acquit them.

Proverbs 17:15 declares: "Acquitting the guilty and condemning the innocent—the Lord detests them both." Judges who twist law to harm the innocent aren't protected; they're detested. And in 1 Samuel 8:10-18, God warns against kings (or rulers) who take what isn't theirs: "He will take your sons... your daughters... the best of your fields... a tenth of your grain... your menservants and maidservants... He will take a tenth of your flocks, and you yourselves will become his slaves." This paints abusive authority as theft and enslavement, with no immunity mentioned—only consequences.

These biblical tenets influenced Western law, reminding us that judicial power is a trust, not a license for crime. A judge who maims or kills isn't acting judicially; they're a criminal in a costume. The robe doesn't transform murder into a "ruling"—it's still homicide, prosecutable like any other. The same applies for every crime. There is no judicial immunity for criminal activity and civil liability is waived when actions are taken *Ultra Vires* and in bad faith.

Historical Documents: Limiting Power from Magna Carta to Present Day

The idea that judges aren't above the law evolved through landmark documents that curbed royal and judicial tyranny, ensuring accountability for crimes. These texts show immunity is narrow, never extending to criminal acts like violence or corruption.

The **Magna Carta (1215)**, the great charter of liberties, declared no one—not even the king or his judges—is above the law. Clause 39 states: "No free man shall be seized or imprisoned, or stripped of his rights or possessions... except by the lawful judgment of his equals or by the law of the land." Clause 40 adds: "To no one will we sell, to no one deny or delay right or justice." This targeted corrupt judges who abused process for gain, establishing that judicial acts must be lawful—no immunity for illegal seizures or delays, like in modern PFAs without due process.

The **Habeas Corpus Act 1679** reinforced this by protecting against unlawful detention, holding judges accountable for illegal imprisonments. It penalized officials (£500 fine) for denying writs or delaying justice, showing judges could face civil and criminal liability for rights deprivations. No robe protected false imprisonment— a precursor to modern accountability for judicial overreach.

The **English Declaration of Rights of 1688** (leading to the Bill of Rights 1689) protested James II's abuses, including judicial misconduct. It declared: "That excessive bail ought not to be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted." And "that jurors ought to be duly impanelled and returned." This limited judges from arbitrary acts,

affirming no immunity for cruelty or bias—echoing prohibitions on maiming or killing under guise of authority.

The **English Bill of Rights 1689** codified these, stating "that no man should be put out of his franchise or freehold... but by the judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land." It barred "illegal and cruel punishments," ensuring judges couldn't hide behind office for crimes. This influenced U.S. law, where judicial immunity doesn't cover murder or assault—robes don't license violence.

The **Act of July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 502)** mandated oaths for officials: "I do solemnly swear... that I will support and defend the Constitution... and that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same." Violating this oath (e.g., ignoring supremacy) is perjury or treason, stripping immunity—judges swearing falsely lose protection for criminal acts.

The **American Declaration of Independence (1776)** accused the king of judicial abuses: "He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone... for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries." It decried "depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury" and "transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offences." This set the tone: no immunity for tyrannical judges—crimes like denying trials or fair process warrant removal.

The **U.S. Constitution** limits immunity implicitly. Article III vests judicial power but doesn't grant blanket protection. The Supremacy Clause (Art. VI) binds judges to federal law, with no exception for crimes. Amendments (5th, 14th) prohibit deprivations without process—judges violating this face liability, as immunity isn't constitutional.

Judicial Acts (e.g., Judiciary Act of 1789) established courts but didn't create absolute immunity—that developed in case law, limited to judicial functions.

Other texts: Blackstone's Commentaries (1765) noted judges liable for "malice or corruption," not good-faith errors. Federalist No. 78 (Hamilton) said judges have "neither force nor will, but merely judgment," implying no power for crimes.

U.S. Case Law: Immunity's Limits

Let's talk about something important but often misunderstood: judicial immunity. This is the legal idea that judges can't be sued or punished for decisions they make while doing their job. But here's the key point—it's not a free pass for everything. U.S. law makes it clear that this protection, or "immunity," only covers real judicial acts, like making fair rulings in cases they have the right to handle, and only when they're acting in good faith (meaning honestly and following the rules). If a judge does something that's not part of their job, like committing a crime such as assault or murder, or if they act with bad intentions (like being corrupt or biased on purpose), that immunity disappears. Judges aren't like kings who can do whatever they want just because they're wearing a robe—they're public servants, and the law holds them accountable for serious wrongs. Think of it like this: the robe might protect them when they're

playing by the rules, but if they break the law themselves, they're just like anyone else and can face consequences.

The U.S. Supreme Court and other courts have decided many cases over the years that explain these limits. I'll go through some of the main ones step by step, explaining what happened in simple terms, what the court decided, and why it matters. These cases show that while judges get a lot of protection to do their work without fear, that protection "vanishes" for things that aren't truly judicial, like committing crimes or operating a Black Collar Cartel. For example, if a judge orders an arrest as part of a case, that might be protected, but if they physically attack someone in the courtroom, that's not "judging"—that's assault, and no immunity applies.

- **Randall v. Brigham (74 U.S. 523, 1868):** In this old but important case from the Supreme Court, a lawyer named Randall sued a judge named Brigham for kicking him off a case unfairly. The judge claimed immunity, saying he was just doing his job. The Court agreed that judges have immunity for their official acts, like making decisions in court, but not if they act with "malice" (bad intentions) or "corruption" (like taking bribes or being dishonest). Why does this matter? It shows immunity isn't absolute— if a judge is mean or corrupt on purpose, they can be held responsible. In everyday terms, it's like saying a referee in a game is protected for calling a foul, but not if they punch a player because they're mad.
- **Bradley v. Fisher (80 U.S. 335, 1871):** This Supreme Court case involved a lawyer, Joseph Bradley, who was disbarred (kicked out of practicing law) by Judge Fisher. Bradley sued, saying it was unfair. The Court said judges have "absolute" immunity for acts they do as part of their job, as long as they have jurisdiction (the right to hear the case) and are acting in good faith. But the Court was clear: this doesn't cover "non-judicial" acts, like if a judge assaults someone or does something outside their role. For example, they gave a hypothetical—if a judge convicts someone of a crime that's not actually a crime, that's still protected if done in court, but physical violence like assault isn't. This case set the basic rule: immunity sticks to real judging, not bad behavior. Imagine a teacher who's protected when grading papers but not if they steal from the school—same idea for judges.
- **Stump v. Sparkman (435 U.S. 349, 1978):** This Supreme Court case is famous (or infamous) for testing immunity's boundaries. A judge named Stump approved a petition to sterilize a 15-year-old girl without her knowledge or a hearing—it was done secretly. Years later, she sued. The Court said the judge had immunity because approving petitions was a "judicial act" within his jurisdiction, even if it was wrong or harmful. But the Court stressed: immunity only applies if the act is truly judicial (like deciding cases) and within the court's power. If it's "extrajudicial" (outside judging, like committing a crime such as killing someone), no protection. Why important? It shows even terrible decisions might be immune if "judicial," but crimes like murder aren't judging—they're just crimes. Picture a doctor protected for surgery but not for robbing a patient; judges are similar—no shield for non-judge crimes in participation of a cartel.
- **Mireles v. Waco (502 U.S. 9, 1991):** In this Supreme Court case, a judge named Mireles got mad and ordered police to "rough up" a lawyer who was late to court. The lawyer

sued for assault. The judge claimed immunity. The Court said ordering an arrest is a judicial act, so immune, but if the judge himself had done the assault (like physically hitting someone), that wouldn't be "judicial"—it'd be personal, and no immunity. The key takeaway: immunity covers what judges do from the bench, like giving orders, but not if they step down and commit crimes themselves. For instance, a judge can't claim immunity for shooting someone in court—that's not judging, that's battery and murder. It's like a boss protected for firing someone but not for punching them.

- **Forrester v. White (484 U.S. 219, 1988)**: The Supreme Court here dealt with a judge who fired a probation officer named Forrester, who sued claiming discrimination. The judge said immunity. The Court ruled no—firing employees is an "administrative act" (like running an office), not a judicial one (like deciding cases), so no immunity. This matters because it shows immunity doesn't cover everything a judge does; again, possession of judicial robes doesn't lead to blanket immunity. Crimes like violence or theft are non-judicial or administrative, open to lawsuits or prosecution. Imagine a principal protected for teaching but not for stealing school supplies—judges can't hide behind the robe for non-judging wrongs.
- **Pulliam v. Allen (466 U.S. 522, 1984)**: A magistrate judge named Pulliam was jailing people for non-jailable offenses unless they posted bond. Lawyer Allen sued to stop it. The judge claimed immunity. The Supreme Court said no—while judges can't always be sued for money, you can get "injunctive relief" (a court order to stop) for constitutional violations. No absolute bar to challenging bad acts. This shows immunity isn't a total shield; you can force judges to fix wrongs, especially ongoing ones. For crimes, it's even less protective—no injunction needed for prosecution.
- **Ex parte Virginia (100 U.S. 339, 1879)**: In this Supreme Court case, a judge was indicted for excluding Black jurors based on race, violating federal law. He claimed immunity. The Court said no—judges can be criminally liable for acts under color of office that break federal law. This confirms judges face prosecution for crimes, even if done on the job. Like a cop arrested for bribery—the badge doesn't save them.

Criminal liability is clear: judges can be prosecuted for crimes, no matter the robe. If a judge kills or maims, it's murder or assault, not "judging." The law treats them as regular people for bad faith acts.

The Dugan Case: No Immunity for Criminal Acts

Let's look at a real, recent example to make this concrete. In the case **USA v. Hannah C. Dugan, Case No. 25-CR-89 (E.D. Wis.)**, Federal Judge Lynn Adelman denied a motion to dismiss criminal charges against Dugan, who was a state court judge. He rejected her claim that judicial immunity protects her from criminal prosecution. Dugan was accused of hiding someone from arrest (that's 18 U.S.C. § 1071, basically helping someone avoid getting caught by the police) and blocking the Department of Homeland Security's efforts to deport an undocumented immigrant (18 U.S.C. § 1505, obstructing a government process).

The charges said that Dugan, while acting as a judge, found out about a federal warrant for someone's arrest but then helped hide that person and stopped the government from taking them away. Dugan argued, "I'm a judge, so I'm immune—this was part of my job." But the government said, "No, immunity is for civil lawsuits (where people sue you for money), not criminal cases (where you can go to jail for breaking the law). And besides, what you did wasn't really a 'judicial' act—it was helping someone break the law."

Judge Adelman agreed with the government. He wrote in his decision: "Judicial immunity does not apply to criminal prosecutions." He pointed to older Supreme Court cases like **O'Shea v. Littleton (414 U.S. 488, 1974)** and **Imbler v. Pachtman (424 U.S. 409, 1976)**, which say immunity is meant to protect judges from being sued for money damages in civil court, not from being charged with crimes by the government. The judge explained that there's no law or court decision saying judges can't be criminally prosecuted—Dugan couldn't find any examples, and neither could the court.

The government gave a strong example: "Imagine if a judge murdered someone in their chambers. Would judicial immunity protect them from murder charges? Of course not—that's not a 'judicial act.'" Adelman agreed: even if something looks like judging, if it's way off base or criminal, immunity doesn't apply. In Dugan's case, her actions—hiding someone and blocking deportation—weren't normal judging; they were allegedly breaking federal law.

Adelman summed it up: "Absolute judicial immunity is a defense to civil liability only." This means the robe protects from some lawsuits, but not from jail time for crimes. No past case gives judges a pass on criminal charges, and Dugan had none to show. Even "judicial" acts lose protection if "gravely erroneous" (super wrong), but here, it wasn't judicial at all. This case is ongoing, with a hearing set, but it shows clearly: robes don't make you untouchable for lawbreaking—gavel immunity is limited, not a license for crimes like hiding fugitives or obstructing justice. If a judge can be charged for helping someone dodge immigration, they sure can't claim immunity for worse things like human trafficking, money laundering, racketeering, wire fraud, mail fraud, treason, and/or sedition.

Update: The Dugan Verdict – A Nail in the Coffin for Cartel Delusions of Immunity

Oh, Bill and your Black Collar Cartel buddies, the ink wasn't yet dry on this chapter when fate delivered the perfect postscript: on December 19, 2025, a federal jury in the Eastern District of Wisconsin found Milwaukee County Circuit Court Judge Hannah C. Dugan guilty of felony obstruction under 18 U.S.C. § 1505 for helping an undocumented immigrant dodge ICE agents right in her courtroom. That's not just a felony conviction. That's a wrap on Judicial Immunity for your criminal actions.

That's right—a sitting judge, cloaked in that oh-so-sacred robe, convicted like any common criminal for meddling in federal proceedings. Acquitted on the misdemeanor concealment charge (18 U.S.C. § 1071), sure, but that felony sticks, carrying up to five years in the slammer.

Case No. 2:25-cr-00089, presided over by Judge Lynn Adelman, now stands as a blazing Lighthouse: judicial immunity doesn't touch crimes, folks. You can swing a good faith gavel all day long in court and be protected, but neither robe nor gavel protects you from criminal actions.

She tried to shield an illegal immigrant from the law, much like you guys try to shield each other from the law. This case is an exceptional example of how there's no such thing as immunity for crimes.

This verdict isn't just schadenfreude; it's proof positive for every page of *Convoluting Federal Supremacy*. Dugan thought her bench was a bunker. She thought she could obstruct the feds by alerting the target to the feds in the hall and ushering the target out the rear while agents chased him through traffic. But she didn't get away with it and is instead charged as a criminal. DO YOU GET IT?!? DO YOU SEE THIS APPLIES TO YOU?!?

Your daily doses of due process denials, fraudulent PFAs, and Title IV-D cash grabs aren't "judging"—they're obstruction, extortion, and racketeering, all ripe for federal prosecution. As Adelman ruled pre-trial, immunity shields good faith civil suits, not criminal indictments (echoing O'Shea v. Littleton and Imbler v. Pachtman). If Dugan gets no pass for a single courtroom caper, imagine the fallout for your systemic syndicate: treasonous defiance of federal supremacy, human trafficking via custody thefts, and wire fraud in bogus support orders. My book tallies your harms in the trillions. You have no refuge. The feds are watching, and Dugan's guilty stamp seals your fate: crimes in robes or in chambers are just crimes, prosecutable and punishable.

You may have thought Judicial Immunity was simple and always applied, but it turns out it's "convoluted." I know it's hard for you, but to make it clear you can't commit crimes even if you wear robes.

Conclusion: Judicial Robes and Chambers Shield No Crimes

Judicial immunity clings to the gavel's lawful swing, not the robe's fabric or the Chamber walls. From the Bible to Dugan, history shows judges answer for crimes. No dignity in corruption, judges must face justice like anyone else

AFFIDAVIT OF PROBABLE CAUSE FORMALITIES

I, with a Surname of Reich and a Christian name of Blair Jesse Ellyn, being duly sworn according to law, depose and say that the facts set forth in this affidavit are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief and are based on my first hand personal knowledge and experience as well as my deep review of relevant subject matter material. I am of the age of majority, I am of sound mind, and have been found fit for trial by a competent Pennsylvania based psychiatrist in 2021.

This affidavit is submitted to establish the probable cause for the arrest and prosecution of the serial felon masquerading as Retired Senior Judge William P Mahon (Hereinafter "Bill" while in his personal capacity or Retired Senior Judge William P Mahon while in his judicial capacity) a retired senior judge from Chester County acting by way of direct appointment in Lancaster County by Pennsylvania Supreme Court Chief Justice and co-conspirator Debra Todd to adjudicate Reich v Reich family law matters in Lancaster County, and I'm also establishing probable cause against the entire bench at Lancaster CCP and against the senior officials of Lancaster County and Lancaster DRS.

Bill, in his individual capacity, has acted outside his jurisdiction as a lawfully appointed retired senior judge and delved into the land of unlawful deprivation of rights, retaliation, oppression and a myriad of crimes described herein. Bill's conduct, in his personal capacity, represents an egregious abuse of judicial power, a criminal disregard for the rule of law, tyrannical assault on fundamental rights, and a continuation by this court of unlawful deprivation of Constitutional Rights, retaliation against those who raise them to their defense, and a treasonous and seditious war against the Constitution and Constitutional Republic itself for the unlawful benefit of the Racketeering enterprise.

Bill however is not acting alone. Firstly, unlike other judges who have been placed into the Reich v Reich legal quagmire by operation of law, Bill was hand selected by Supreme Court Chief Justice Debra Todd. He is her agent. By the law of agency Debra is the one ultimately accountable for his actions, not simply because she is the Chief Justice, but more importantly because she is the one who directly authorized his appointment in 2024.

Beyond Bill choosing to act like a despotic tyrant in the absence of constitutional protections it needs to be understood that the entire simulation of law presented by the COURT OF COMMON PLEAS LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA, and Lancaster DRS is in coordination/conspiracy with LANCASTER COUNTY. Every single judge in every single matter I've been involved with from the dozen or so traffic violations like parking tickets through the matters of divorce and custody at the courthouse or support with the Lancaster DRS have failed entirely to honor Federal Supremacy, provide me with comprehensive Due Notice, ensure my Substantive and Procedural Due Process of Law, and has not once acknowledged or considered my right to Equal Protection under the Law.

These actions by these people I allege as treasonous and seditious felons, the very people supposedly protecting the law, not only fail at their purpose, not only offend the constitution, but they intentionally, violently, covertly, and recklessly assault the constitution and the precious tenets of American Jurisprudence. I have been notifying them for five years that their actions are lawless, reckless, unconstitutional, void, and predictably and repeatedly cause irreparable harm to me and my family. They don't care. In Bill's case especially he's deliberately indifferent and reminds me of that frequently on the record.

Their actions demand the harshest possible criminal persecution to restore justice and deter such treason and despotic treachery stemming from the Lancaster County Judiciary, Lancaster DRS, and Lancaster County itself. It spreads to Pennsylvania DHS, and is interstate connected to Federal HHS via the Social Security Administration. DAs and AGs are compromised, appellate courts are compromised, Judicial Conduct Boards are compromised, Disciplinary Committees are compromised, and rotating Sr. Judges are compromised. The Governor's signature sits on the very contract that makes all of this possible in the COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA.

The constitution and the Bill of Rights are blood soaked from tyrants, patriots, and innocent bystanders and the actions of these wrongdoers disgrace our historic tradition of constitutional law and our cultural heritage of a lawful and exceptional American Republic.

AFFIDAVIT OF PROBABLE CAUSE

Based on the sworn facts and circumstances set forth in this Affidavit, there is probable cause to believe and I do believe the following offenses have been committed by individuals acting within the County of Lancaster, the Court of Common Pleas of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, Lancaster DRS, Lancaster District Attorney's office, Pennsylvania Attorney General's Office, Pennsylvania DHS, Federal HHS, and Federal SSA.

I. Federal Crimes

A. 18 U.S.C. § 242 — Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law

Rule (abridged): Whoever, under color of law, willfully subjects any person to the deprivation of rights secured by the Constitution or federal law commits a federal offense (enhanced penalties for bodily injury, weapons, etc.).

Elements:

1. The defendant acted under color of state law;
2. The conduct deprived a person of a right secured by the Constitution/laws of the U.S.;
3. The defendant acted willfully (specific intent to deprive a known right). Application to Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich:
 - Color of law: Judges, court officers, DRS personnel, and county officials acted in their official capacities.
 - Deprivations:
 - Due Process (14th Amendment): No meaningful pre-deprivation hearing before seizures; rubber-stamped "per curiam" notices; factual findings unsupported by evidence; refusal to apply Mathews v. Eldridge balancing; disregard of burdens/standards of proof and scrutiny where fundamental rights are implicated.
 - Equal Protection (14th Amendment): Consistent disparate treatment of Mr. Reich versus similarly situated litigants; preferential process aligned with Title IV-D reimbursement incentives.
 - Parental Liberty (Troxel v. Granville): Restrictions on Form of Custody without compelling state interest and without clear and convincing evidence.
 - Willfulness: Officials were repeatedly placed on notice (see Affidavits and note the Habeas Corpus Lawsuit docket number CI-25-00735) that actions violated federal rights yet persisted, evincing specific intent or deliberate indifference tantamount to willfulness.
 - Harm: Severe emotional distress, unlawful asset seizures, financial injury, and ongoing interference with family integrity (Exs. 5).

B. 18 U.S.C. § 241 — Conspiracy Against Rights

Rule: If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in the free exercise of constitutional rights, they commit a federal felony (enhanced if kidnapping, attempt to kill, etc.).

Elements:

1. Agreement between two or more persons;
2. Purpose to interfere with a federal right;
3. Overt acts in furtherance. Application:
 - Agreement/Coordination: Pattern of coordinated judicial orders, uniform DRS practices, synchronized rejection of objections, and any support from media outlets, and synchronized denial of motions (e.g., denials of recusal, motions to vacate, and reconsideration on August 27, 2025, and October 22, 2025).
 - Purpose: To maintain outcomes that maximize collections/withholdings and suppress challenges to unconstitutional practices.
 - Overt Acts: Repeated issuance/enforcement of defective orders; denial of hearings; suppression/ignoring of exculpatory/mitigating material; synchronized threats of sanction or adverse action when Mr. Reich persisted in asserting rights (Exs. Signed Confession by WPM).

C. 18 U.S.C. §§ 2381–2384 — Treason / Seditious Conspiracy (as notified)

Rule (abridged): Treason and seditious conspiracy criminalize, inter alia, levying war against the U.S. or conspiring by force to oppose or hinder execution of federal law.

Application (notice theory):

- This Affidavit places authorities on notice of a systematic war against the Federal Constitution through deliberate nullification of Due Process/Equal Protection to sustain a funding-driven adjudication scheme. The factual thrust is that officials, after years of explicit notice, continued to hinder execution of federal constitutional law.
- While the force element for § 2384 is typically physical, this filing preserves the allegation that the operation functionally prevents and delays execution of federal law across classes of litigants. (Reserved for prosecutorial evaluation given the statute's strict construction.)

D. 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961–1968 — RICO

Rule: It is unlawful for any person employed by or associated with any enterprise engaged in or affecting interstate commerce to conduct or participate in the conduct of such enterprise's affairs through a pattern of racketeering activity (two or more predicate acts within 10 years).

Elements:

1. Enterprise: Formal or informal association (county + court + DRS personnel);
2. Interstate Commerce: Funding and communications cross state lines (Title IV-D flows; synchronized filings and orders);
3. Pattern: Related predicates, continuity (closed-ended or open-ended);
4. Racketeering Acts (predicate offenses): e.g., mail fraud (§ 1341), wire fraud (§ 1343), honest-services fraud (§ 1346), money laundering (§§ 1956–1957), extortion under color of official right (§ 1951), obstruction (§§ 1503, 1512–1513). Application:
 - Enterprise: County agencies, DRS, CCP administrative/judicial actors functioning as a continuing unit.
 - Commerce: Federal reimbursements; interstate banking channels; U.S. mails and wires used for notices, orders, withholding instructions (Exs. U–Z).
 - Predicates:
 - Mail Fraud (§ 1341): Mailing fraudulently-procured or void ab initio orders/levy notices; reliance on omissions of required due process to obtain money/property.
 - Wire Fraud (§ 1343): Electronic transmissions of the same (court e-filings, DRS portals, synchronized denials).
 - Money Laundering (§§ 1956–1957): Financial transactions to conceal or integrate proceeds derived from unconstitutional exactions tied to defective process and false pretenses of lawfulness.
 - Hobbs Act Extortion (§ 1951): Obtaining property under color of official right via unlawful threats of incarceration/sanction predicated on void or constitutionally defective orders.
 - Pattern: Multi-year continuity; repeated application across multiple orders and seizures; synchronized threats and denials (e.g., August 27, 2025 orders denying recusal and strike).
 - Nexus to Title IV-D: Biased adjudication and enforcement increase federal reimbursements, providing motive and financial structure for racketeering continuity.

E. 18 U.S.C. § 1581–1594 — Peonage, Slavery, and Human Trafficking

Rule (abridged): Prohibits holding in peonage, involuntary servitude, or trafficking for forced labor/services through coercion or abuse of law.

Elements:

1. Coercion through force, threats, or abuse of legal process;
2. Obtaining labor/services;
3. Knowing or reckless disregard. Application:
 - Coercion: Threats of incarceration and sanctions to compel financial performance (e.g., October 9, 2025 order restricting contact).
 - Labor: Forced income production under duress.
 - Knowledge: Officials on notice via affidavits yet persisted.

F. 18 U.S.C. § 1590–1591 — Human Trafficking by Coercion and Exploitation

Rule (abridged): Prohibits recruiting/obtaining persons for labor through force, fraud, or coercion.

Elements:

1. Knowing recruitment/harboring;
2. For coerced labor;
3. Financial benefit. Application:
 - Coercion: Psychological/financial control via biased orders (e.g., full custody to Mother without basis).
 - Benefit: Reimbursements from enforced obligations.

G. 18 U.S.C. § 1957 — Unjust Enrichment and Fraudulent Conversion (with Common Law)

Rule (abridged): Prohibits monetary transactions in criminally derived property.

Elements:

1. Transaction > \$10,000;
2. Property from specified unlawful activity;
3. Knowledge of derivation. Application:
 - Derived Property: Funds from unconstitutional seizures.
 - Knowledge: Officials aware via notices.

H. 18 U.S.C. § 1505 — Obstruction of Justice

Rule (abridged): Whoever corruptly obstructs or impedes a proceeding commits an offense.

Elements:

1. Pending proceeding;
2. Knowledge;
3. Corrupt endeavor to influence/impede. Application:
 - Impediment: Denials of motions to vacate/recuse (e.g., August 27, 2025) to block justice.

I. 18 U.S.C. § 1621 — Perjury

Rule (abridged): Willful false statement under oath in federal proceeding.

Elements:

1. Oath/affirmation;

2. False material statement;
3. Willfulness. Application:
 - False Oaths: Officials' oaths to uphold Constitution breached by actions (e.g., October 9, 2025 order ignoring rights).

J. 18 U.S.C. § 3 — Accessory After the Fact

Rule: Whoever, knowing an offense has been committed, assists the offender to hinder punishment.

Elements:

1. Knowledge of offense;
2. Assistance to avoid apprehension/punishment. Application:
 - Cover-Ups: Denials/synchronized orders shielding prior violations (e.g., August 27, 2025 recusal denial).

K. 18 U.S.C. § 1341 — Mail Fraud

Rule (abridged): Whoever devises a scheme to defraud and uses mails for execution commits fraud.

Elements:

1. Scheme to defraud;
2. Use of mails;
3. Intent to defraud. Application: Mailing defective orders/notices to obtain property via omitted due process.

L. 18 U.S.C. § 1343 — Wire Fraud

Rule (abridged): Scheme to defraud using wires.

Elements: As above, with wire use.

Application: Electronic filings/denials for same scheme.

II. Pennsylvania Crimes

A. 18 Pa.C.S. § 903 — Criminal Conspiracy

Elements:

1. Agreement with one or more persons;
2. Intent to promote/facilitate a crime;
3. Overt act in furtherance. Application: Agreements among court/DRS personnel to employ known-unconstitutional procedures; overt acts include issuance/enforcement of biased orders, synchronized denials (e.g., August 27, 2025 orders).

B. 18 Pa.C.S. § 5301 — Official Oppression

Elements: A person acting or purporting to act in official capacity, knowing conduct is illegal, (1) subjects another to seizure, dispossession, assessment, lien, or (2) denies/impedes the exercise of a right.

Application: Knowing continuation of unconstitutional practices after formal notice; unlawful property seizures without lawful pre-deprivation hearings; impediments to parental liberty and due process (e.g., October 9, 2025 custody restrictions).

C. 18 Pa.C.S. § 4952 — Intimidation of Witnesses or Victims

Elements: With intent to influence/delay/prevent testimony or retaliate for lawful participation, uses force, intimidation, threat, or deception.

Application: William P. Mahon, Thomas Ost-Prisco, and David Sunday (as alleged) threatened or signaled legal retaliation to chill Mr. Reich's continued assertion of constitutional rights and objections (Exs.: unattached previous Criminal Complaint re David Sunday and Thomas Ost-Prisco).

D. 18 Pa.C.S. § 2901 — Kidnapping (primary theory reserved; alternate charge preserved)

Rule: Unlawful removal or confinement for substantial period in a place of isolation with specified intents (ransom, facilitate felony, terrorize, or interfere with government function).

Application (preservation): Mr. Reich alleges functional confinement of his parental relationship via unlawful geographic and custodial restrictions derived from void/defective orders (e.g., October 9, 2025). To the extent prosecutors deem § 2901 inapplicable given its physical confinement elements, Mr. Reich alternatively alleges:

- 18 Pa.C.S. § 2904 — Interference with Custody of Children, and

- Contempt/Abuse of Process predicated on void ab initio orders to effectuate unlawful deprivation of parent-child access.

E. 18 Pa.C.S. § 3921 — Theft by Unlawful Taking

Rule: Unlawfully taking movable property with intent to deprive.

Elements:

1. Unlawful taking/appropriation;
2. Movable property of another;
3. Intent to deprive permanently. Application: Seizures of income/assets via void orders (e.g., post-October 9, 2025 enforcement); intent inferred from persistence after notices.

F. 18 Pa.C.S. § 5101 — Obstructing Administration of Law

Rule: Intentionally obstructs, impairs, or perverts administration of law by force, violence, intimidation, or deception.

Elements:

1. Intentional act;
2. Obstructs/perverts law administration;
3. By specified means. Application: Deceptive denials (e.g., August 27, 2025 recusal order ignoring bias); intimidation via threats of sanctions.

G. 18 Pa.C.S. § 4902 — Perjury

Rule: Willful false statement under oath in official proceeding.

Elements:

1. Oath;
2. Material falsity;
3. Willfulness. Application: Breaches of judicial/official oaths to uphold Constitution (e.g., October 9, 2025 order violating rights); false findings without evidence.

H. 18 Pa.C.S. § 5105 — Hindering Apprehension (Accessory After the Fact)

Rule: With intent to hinder apprehension/prosecution, conceals/destroys evidence or provides false information.

Elements:

1. Knowledge of offense;
2. Intent to hinder;
3. Act of assistance. Application: Synchronized denials covering prior violations (e.g., August 27, 2025 orders).

I. 18 Pa.C.S. § 2701 — Assault (and § 2709 — Harassment)

Rule (abridged): Attempts to cause or recklessly causes bodily injury; or harasses with intent to annoy/alarm via physical contact or threats.

Elements:

1. Intent/recklessness;
2. Bodily injury or apprehension thereof. Application: Threats of incarceration causing emotional/physical distress (e.g., October 9, 2025 order).

III. Venue, Jurisdiction, and Referral Notes

- Conduct occurred in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania (state jurisdiction) and implicated federal constitutional rights (federal jurisdiction).
- Given the federal predicates (18 U.S.C. §§241, 242, 1341, 1343, 1951, 1956–57, 1961–68), this Affidavit is appropriate for referral to the United States Attorney’s Office (E.D. Pa.) and the FBI.
- State offenses are properly referred to the Lancaster County District Attorney and/or the Pennsylvania Attorney General.

IV. COMBINED CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS

The combined conduct of the County of Lancaster and Court of Common Pleas violates:

- First Amendment: Retaliation against protected petitioning and complaint activities (Hartman v. Moore, 547 U.S. 250 (2006)).
- Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments: Deprivation of property and liberty without due process; denial of equal protection.
- Thirteenth Amendment: Coerced labor and involuntary servitude through debt-based threats and punitive enforcement.
- Eighth Amendment: Excessive fines and cruel punishment through economically destructive levies.
- Article VI, Clause 2 (Supremacy Clause): State and county acts repugnant to the Constitution are void ab initio (Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803)).

PRAYER FOR PROSECUTION

This affidavit establishes Probable Cause that the COUNTY OF LANCASTER, in concert and conspiracy with the COURT OF COMMON PLEAS LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA and LANCASTER DRS, operates an ongoing criminal enterprise in violation of federal and constitutional law. The enterprise's pattern of racketeering activity includes, but is not limited to:

- Systematic Deprivation of Rights under Color of Law (18 U.S.C. §242);
- Conspiracy Against Rights (18 U.S.C. §241);
- Wire Fraud and Mail Fraud (18 U.S.C. §§1341, 1343);
- Money Laundering through unlawful Title IV-D reimbursements (18 U.S.C. §§1956–1957);
- Ongoing Treason and Sedition against the Federal Constitution (18 U.S.C. §§2381–2384).

Each omission of Fundamental Fairness is not an accident, but an act of commission disguised as omission. It is a sophisticated covert evasion designed to appear lawful on its face, while deliberately warring with the Federal Constitution beneath the surface. The Constitution is not a polite or voluntary suggestion—it is the supreme law of the land, and any operation that systematically nullifies it for profit is not a government, but a racketeering enterprise masquerading as one.

Therefore, I demand that the Office of the District Attorney for Lancaster County open an immediate criminal investigation under the authority of 18 U.S.C. §§1961–1968, 18 U.S.C. §§241–242, and applicable Pennsylvania statutes including 18 Pa.C.S. §903 (Criminal Conspiracy) and §5301 (Official Oppression), among others. Your previous failure and refusal to act upon previous sworn affidavits constitutes Treason, as this office is still, currently, and once again on formal notice of felonies, treason and sedition committed against the People of the Commonwealth and the Federal Constitution.

For this reason I'm sending this document to an array of people outside of your organization such as the State Attorney general, FBI, DOJ, DoD, US AG, and numerous elected officials to keep escalating the amount of pressure you face regarding the severity of the crimes contained herein while resolutely derelict in your duty to perform. If you receive this document you should read about Misprision of Treason before deciding what you do next. Also, I'll be contacting State and Federal HHS. That's the money trail. That's the supply line for this criminal enterprise. Like a kamikaze fighter I'm going to nose dive into uncomfortable conversations that include "Treason" and "Misprision of Treason" with the folks that are providing expense reimbursement and Title IV-D matching funding that stems from Federal HHS and enables this interstate racket to continue to operate. Like a kamikaze fighter I'm going to nose dive into uncomfortable conversations that include "Treason" and "Misprision of Treason" with the folks that are providing expense reimbursement and Title IV-D matching funding that stems from Federal HHS and enables this interstate racket to continue to operate.

I'm aware the road to enforcement of crimes by government officials against government officials is uphill, long, and treacherous, but it turns out I have sufficient and extensive motivation stemming from the bad guys holding my children, income, and property hostage for five years as part of an interstate racketeering enterprise. I will not tire. I will not quit. I'll see this through to my last breath.

I know it's grueling, but I try to have some fun with it along the way and hope you can appreciate small doses of irreverence as I provide seismic responses to seismic disruptions of the peace and dignity of Pennsylvania to a few variety of State and Federal departments and uncomfortably provide notice and disclosure to extensive interstate crimes which have grave consequences and have been committed by conspiring government officials.

NOTICE AND DEMAND

This Notice and Demand is a formal alert to all parties involved in my matters—judges, court staff, my ex-spouse, her lawyer, and related government officials—that they have violated my rights in serious ways. I'll break it down into federal, state, and commercial law violations, explaining each simply for those new to this. Think of it as a roadmap showing where you went wrong, backed by laws and court decisions. In the end, I demand you fix it or face consequences.

Federal Violations

Federal law is the highest level of law in the U.S., based on the Constitution, which protects basic rights like fairness in court and family life. Here's how they've broken these rules in my PFA (Protection from Abuse), custody, support, and divorce matters. I'll explain key laws and cases in bullets, making sure to describe what each one means and why it applies here. For example, the Constitution is like the rulebook for the whole country—it says government can't treat you unfairly or take your stuff without a good reason and a fair chance to fight back.

Under the LEX-CIVIX framework (that's a way to organize law like a pyramid: Constitution at the top, then federal statutes, court decisions, regulations, and rules at the bottom), the violations are clear. Starting with the Constitution (the foundation), they've taken away your rights without reason; federal statutes (laws from Congress) make that a crime; court cases (judges' decisions from the past) say it has to be fair; regulations (detailed rules from agencies) require steps like notices; and court rules (day-to-day procedures) were ignored.

- PFA Issues: The ex parte (that means "from one side only," where the judge hears just my ex's story without you there) order on April 5, 2021, was issued without giving me notice (a heads-up that something's happening) or a chance to defend myself, even though my ex admitted in writing she wasn't afraid. This skipped basic fairness, like not letting me tell your side of the story, and the delay (called a continuance, where they push back the court date) was only supposed to be for my side to prepare, not hers—it was an unfair trick to keep things going against me, dragging out the case and keeping me from your kids longer.
 - **14th Amendment (Due Process Clause)**: This is a part of the U.S. Constitution that says the government can't take away important things in my life, like my relationship with your kids or my money, without giving me a fair process first—things like a hearing where I can speak up and present evidence. They didn't do that here, just issuing the order based on one side. Case: **Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319 (1976)** – This Supreme Court case says courts have to weigh how important the right is against what the government wants before taking it away; in my case, they didn't balance anything—they just sided with my ex without hearing me, and at no point did she allege an actual offense worthy of a PFA.

- **14th Amendment (Equal Protection Clause):** This means the law has to treat everyone the same, without favorites. My case was handled differently, like they bent rules to help my ex or make more money for the state through things like high support payments. Case: **Village of Willowbrook v. Olech, 528 U.S. 562 (2000)** – The Supreme Court said even if it's just one person being treated badly on purpose without a good reason, that's illegal; here, it seems like they targeted me to keep the case going for financial gain.
- **5th Amendment (Takings Clause):** This says the government can't take my property (like money or even your time with kids, which has value) without paying me back or having a fair reason. The PFA took my family time without any payoff or process. Case: **Eastern Enterprises v. Apfel, 524 U.S. 498 (1998)** – The Court said making someone pay back money or lose something important without fairness is like stealing; that's what happened with the quick PFA that cost you family access.
- **18 U.S.C. § 242 (Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law):** This law says if officials (like judges or court staff) use their job to take away my constitutional rights on purpose, it's a crime. They knew the PFA was unfair but did it anyway. Case: **Screws v. United States, 325 U.S. 91 (1945)** – The Supreme Court said if they willfully ignore rights, it's criminal; here, ignoring your side was willful.
- **45 C.F.R. § 302.56 (Support Guidelines Regulations):** These are federal rules saying states have to use fair ways to calculate support money; they ignored this to rush the PFA, which tied into money issues later.
- **Custody Issues:** Most orders (except December 2022) didn't follow rules for fair parenting time. The June 2025 order turned a casual meeting into a full decision without warning you, taking my kids away completely—that's not allowed for fit parents (meaning parents who haven't done anything wrong like abuse or neglect).
 - **14th Amendment (Parental Rights):** The Constitution says parents have a basic right to be with and raise their kids, and the government can't step in unless there's a really good reason, like danger to the child. They took my kids without proving I'm unfit. Case: **Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57 (2000)** – The Supreme Court said if you're a good parent, courts can't just decide to limit time without strong evidence; here, there was no proof, just my ex's false reports.
 - **1st Amendment (Free Speech):** This protects my right to speak out, like complaining about unfair court decisions. Officials scared me with visits or threats to stop me from fighting back. Case: **Hartman v. Moore, 547 U.S. 250 (2006)** – The Court said if they punish me for speaking, it's illegal; the home visits felt like a method to chill my speech and shut me up.
 - **42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Civil Rights Act):** This law lets me sue government people if they break my constitutional rights while doing their job. The custody changes hurt my family without fairness. Case: **Monell v. Dept. of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658 (1978)** – The Supreme Court said if it's part of a pattern or policy (like always favoring one side), the government can be sued; this sure seems like a pattern in my five-year high conflict divorce with constant due process violations.

- **18 U.S.C. § 241 (Conspiracy Against Rights)**: If two or more people team up to take my rights away, it's a crime. Officials and my ex worked together to keep my kids. Case: **United States v. Guest, 383 U.S. 745 (1966)** – The Court said conspiracies to hurt rights are serious crimes, even if by officials.
- **45 C.F.R. § 302.70 (Custody-Related Regulations)**: Even if somehow support isn't unconstitutional it's still true that Federal rules say custody decisions tied to support must be fair; they violated this by taking my kids to enlarge support.
- Support Issues: Orders took my money without real checks for fairness, ignoring my notices about constitutional problems. The judge even said he's not bound by federal law—that's wrong.
 - **5th Amendment (Due Process in Takings)**: The government can't take my stuff (like money from your paycheck) without a fair chance to argue against it. They garnished wages without listening to my side. Case: **Sniadach v. Family Finance Corp., 395 U.S. 337 (1969)** – The Supreme Court said taking wages before a hearing is unfair if it causes hardship; this happened to me, leaving me short on money.
 - **45 C.F.R. § 303.100 (Title IV-D Regulations)**: These federal rules say child support collection must include due process, like notice and hearings; they ignored this to grab money fast for the state.
 - **Bradley Amendment (42 U.S.C. § 666)**: This law says support orders can't be changed back in time, but it's unconstitutional if it doesn't let me argue I can't pay. Case: **Turner v. Rogers, 564 U.S. 431 (2011)** – The Court said I can't jail someone for not paying without checking if they really can afford it; my case feels like punishment without that check.
 - **18 U.S.C. § 1957 (Money Laundering)**: It's illegal to use money from bad activities in normal transactions. The state took my money from unfair orders and used it. Case: **United States v. Loe, 248 F.3d 449 (5th Cir. 2001)** – The court said if money comes from illegal stuff, using it is a crime; here, the support money came from unfair court decisions.
 - **28 U.S.C. § 1654 (Right to Appear Pro Se)**: This says I can represent myself in court; they ignored and mocked my filings, treating me like you don't count.
- Divorce Issues: One-sided rulings let my ex ambush me with 500 pages 3 hours before my hearing without time to respond, ignoring my rights. When he said “proceed” despite my objections he violated my right to Due Notice.
 - **14th Amendment (Procedural Due Process)**: I need notice (a warning) and a chance to speak before the court decides something big, like splitting property. They let surprises happen. Case: **Cleveland Bd. of Educ. v. Loudermill, 470 U.S. 532 (1985)** – The Supreme Court said even in job or money cases, I get a hearing first; same should apply to divorce.
 - **5th Amendment (Just Compensation)**: If they take or divide your stuff unfairly, it's like stealing without paying back. Case: **Armstrong v. United States, 364 U.S. 40 (1960)** – The Court said government can't ruin your property value without compensation; unfair divorce splits do that.

- **42 U.S.C. § 1983**: This lets you sue for rights breaks by officials. Case: **Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police, 491 U.S. 58 (1989)** – The Court said if it's ongoing wrong, I can sue the state; your divorce drags on unfairly.
- Other Issues: Wife and Wendy kept working with the system after knowing it's broken, helping the violations. DA and AG ignored investigations and scared you with visits. PA DHS didn't give full info on your requests. Federal HHS/SSA lets bad funding continue. The money setup rewards high payments over fairness.
 - **18 U.S.C. § 241 (Conspiracy Against Rights)**: If people team up to violate my rights. Case: **United States v. Price, 383 U.S. 787 (1966)** – The Supreme Court said officials conspiring to hurt people is a crime; seems like they teamed up against me.
 - **5 U.S.C. § 552 (FOIA)**: This is the Freedom of Information Act, saying government must share info when asked; PA DHS ignored my requests for details.
 - **42 U.S.C. § 666 (Social Security Act Title IV-D)**: This law is for child support help, but they used it to take money without fairness.
 - **18 U.S.C. § 1589 (Forced Labor)**: Can't force work with threats. Case: **United States v. Dann, 652 F.3d 1160 (9th Cir. 2011)** – The court said even mind tricks to make my work count as bad; threats to take kids if I don't pay feel like that.
 - **13th Amendment (No Slavery)**: No forced work at all. Case: **United States v. Kozminski, 487 U.S. 931 (1988)** – The Supreme Court said using law to force labor is like slavery; support orders forcing me to work hard without say-so are wrong.

State Violations

Pennsylvania laws are supposed to protect fairness in family matters, but they've been twisted. We'll explain the key ones in bullets.

- PFA Issues: Didn't meet the law's requirements for real danger, and continuance was wrong.
 - **23 Pa.C.S. § 6107 (PFA Act)**: This PA law says to get a PFA, there must be proof of actual abuse or threat; there was no proof here, just words, and they gave a continuance (delay) only meant for the person accused to prepare, not the accuser.
 - **Pa.R.C.P. 1901.5 (PFA Rules)**: These rules say PFAs need quick hearings to be fair; the delays turned it into a tool to keep me from your kids longer than needed.
 - **Com. v. Haigh, 874 A.2d 1174 (Pa. Super. 2005)**: A PA court said PFAs can't be used as a way to win custody fights; that's exactly what happened here, using the PFA to control the kids.
- Custody Issues: Orders gave unequal time without good reasons; June 2025 was a surprise attack.
 - **23 Pa.C.S. § 5328 (Custody Factors)**: PA law lists 16 things courts must look at for what's best for kids, like both parents' roles; they ignored this and took my

- kids without evidence. I was unfit and did not consistently provide opinion and order on the factors.
- **Pa.R.C.P. 1915.4 (Custody Rules)**: Rules say you get notice before a hearing; the judge changed it on their own without telling me, which is unfair.
 - **Ettinger v. Ettinger, 637 A.2d 1362 (Pa. Super. 1994)**: A PA court said if both parents are good, they should get equal time; needing proof of harm to change that—none here.
 - **Support Issues**: Took money without checking if it's fair or constitutional.
 - **Pa.R.C.P. 1910.16 (Support Guidelines)**: PA rules say support is based on what I earn, but it has to be reasonable and allow changes if life changes; they ignored my requests and kept unfair amounts.
 - **23 Pa.C.S. § 4352 (Support Enforcement)**: Law allows adjusting support for new situations; they denied without reason, keeping me paying too much.
 - **Ball v. Minnick, 648 A.2d 1192 (Pa. 1994)**: A PA court said support shouldn't punish the payer; my orders feel like punishment, not help for kids.
 - **Divorce Issues**: Let one side dominate without fair chances.
 - **Pa.R.C.P. 1920.51 (Divorce Rules)**: PA rules say divorce hearings must be fair with notice; ambushes (surprise moves) break this by not giving me time to prepare.
 - **Sinclair v. Sinclair, 513 A.2d 403 (Pa. Super. 1986)**: A PA court said property split must treat both sides equal; not in my case, with favoritism.
 - **Other Issues**: Wife/Wendy helped the system after warnings. DA/AG blocked probes and scared you. PA DHS hid info. Prothonotary blocked filings without penalty. PA DHS sent money without checks. Setup rewards lawyers and state over families.
 - **18 Pa.C.S. § 903 (Conspiracy)**: PA crime for teaming up to break laws; Wife and lawyers did this by keeping the unfair system going.
 - **18 Pa.C.S. § 5101 (Obstructing Law)**: Can't block justice on purpose; DA/AG did by ignoring my complaints.
 - **65 P.S. § 67.101 (Right-to-Know Law)**: PA law says you can get government records; PA DHS hid info from me.
 - **18 Pa.C.S. § 5301 (Official Oppression)**: Officials can't abuse power to hurt people; Prothonotary did by blocking my papers.
 - **23 Pa.C.S. § 4301 (Support Duties)**: Support is for kids, not to harm parents; abused to hurt me.
 - **Com. v. Bolden, 373 A.2d 90 (Pa. 1977)**: PA court said officials must follow the constitution; they ignored federal rules over state ones.

Commercial Violations

Think of commercial law like business rules for fair deals—it's about contracts and money being handled honestly. They broke these too, treating court like a scam where deals are rigged.

- **PFA Issues**: Fake order like bad contract without real terms—no proof needed for a real deal.

- **UCC § 3-305 (Defenses to Instruments):** This uniform law (used across states) says if something's based on fraud, it's not enforceable—like a fake check.
- **13 Pa.C.S. § 3305:** PA's version of the same; the PFA had no real basis, so it's invalid.
- Custody Issues: Bad-faith decisions, like June 2025 surprise—not honest dealing.
 - **UCC § 1-304 (Good Faith Obligation):** Every deal must be honest and fair; they broke this by changing rules without telling me.
 - **13 Pa.C.S. § 1304:** PA law saying the same; the surprise was dishonest.
- Support Issues: Theft of money—like taking cash without right.
 - **UCC § 3-420 (Conversion):** Wrongly taking someone's money or property.
 - **13 Pa.C.S. § 3420:** PA version; bad wage takes without fair check.
- Divorce Issues: Unfair favoritism like bad deal—one side wins without fairness.
 - **UCC § 1-203 (Fair Dealing):** Deals must be fair for everyone; ambushes aren't.
 - **13 Pa.C.S. § 1203:** PA good faith rule; ignored to favor one side.
- Other Issues: Wife/Wendy ignored warnings, like breaking notice rules. DA/AG blocked fixes. PA DHS hid info like fraud. HHS/SSA let bad transfers happen. System profits off unfairness.
 - **UCC § 1-202 (Notice):** Must give fair warning before actions; not done here.
 - **13 Pa.C.S. § 1202:** PA notice law; breaches after knowing the system was bad.
 - **UCC § 1-305 (Remedies):** Can't block fixes; DA/AG did.
 - **13 Pa.C.S. § 1309:** PA disclosure; PA DHS hid info.
 - **UCC § 3-305:** Bad money transfers by HHS/SSA.
 - **UCC § 2-302 (Unconscionable Contracts):** Deals too unfair to enforce; incentives make it so.
 - **13 Pa.C.S. § 2302:** PA version; void the bad deals.
 - **Restatement (Second) of Contracts § 208:** If a deal shocks the conscience (is super unfair), it's out; this system does.

Demand: Stop all wrongs now. Give full fixes (cancel orders, return money/kids, investigate) in 10 days. Or we escalate with lawsuits, liens, complaints. You've been warned—ignore at your risk.

CEASE AND DESIST

This Cease and Desist orders you to stop all illegal actions right away. I'll explain the violations simply, with laws and cases in bullets, so you see why it's wrong and must end. If not, face legal blowback. I'll start by explaining each type of violation in detail, like what happened in my case and why it's bad. For example, I'll tell you what the law is about (like "this law says courts can't take my kids without a good reason and a fair chance to argue"), how they broke it (like "they gave your ex extra time but not me "), and what a famous court case says about it (like "the Supreme Court said that's unfair"). I'll repeat some ideas if needed to make sure it's clear, because these wrongs overlap a lot in your PFA, custody, support, and divorce stuff. The goal is to show it's not just one mistake—it's a whole system of unfairness.

Federal Violations

Stop ignoring the Constitution and federal rules that protect basic rights. These are the big national laws that say government can't mess with my life without being fair. Here's how you've messed up, explained plainly. I'll go through each area of your case, like PFA (where they kept you from your kids based on claims that weren't proven), and explain why it's wrong step by step.

- PFA Issues: No fair chance before order or delay. This means they made a quick decision against me without letting you speak, even though my ex said she wasn't scared. That's like punishing me before hearing your side, and they let her delay the case but not me, which kept me away from my kids longer for no good reason.
 - **14th Amendment (Due Process)**: This is a key part of the U.S. Constitution that says the government can't take away important things in my life, like time with my kids, without giving you a fair shot to defend myself—think of it as "innocent until proven guilty" for family stuff. They broke this by issuing the order without notice (a heads-up) or a hearing (my chance to talk). Case: **Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319 (1976)** – This Supreme Court case says courts have to weigh how much it hurts me versus what the government gains before taking action; in my PFA, they didn't weigh anything—they just sided with my ex fast, hurting my family without checking if it was necessary.
 - **14th Amendment (Equal Protection)**: This means laws have to treat everyone the same, no favorites. My case was handled worse, like they gave my ex extra time to prepare but not me, to help her win and maybe get more money for the state. Case: **Village of Willowbrook v. Olech, 528 U.S. 562 (2000)** – The Supreme Court said if they treat me bad on purpose without reason, it's illegal—even if it's just one person; here, it feels like they picked on me to keep the case going for financial reasons.
- Custody Issues: Unfair time splits, surprise June 2025 order. This is where they gave my ex more time with the kids without proving you were a bad parent, and in June 2025, the

judge changed everything on their own without telling me first, taking my kids completely—that's not how fair parenting works.

- **14th Amendment (Parental Rights)**: The Constitution says parents have a special right to be with and raise their kids, and the government can't step in unless there's real proof of danger—like abuse. They took my kids without that proof. Case: **Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57 (2000)** – The Supreme Court said if you're a good parent (fit, meaning no harm to kids), courts can't limit my time just because; they need strong evidence, which wasn't there in my case.
- **1st Amendment (Free Speech)**: This protects my right to speak out, like complaining about unfair decisions. Officials scared me with visits or threats to stop me from fighting. Case: **Hartman v. Moore, 547 U.S. 250 (2006)** – The Court said punishing someone for speaking is wrong; the intimidation felt like they wanted to shut me up so you wouldn't challenge them.
- Support Issues: Taking money without checks. This means they took part of my paycheck or money without making sure it was fair or letting me argue why I couldn't pay that much—the judge even said federal law doesn't bind him, which is totally wrong.
 - **5th Amendment (Takings)**: The government can't take my property (like money) without a good reason and fair process—it's like they can't steal from me. They garnished wages without listening to my side. Case: **Sniadach v. Family Finance Corp., 395 U.S. 337 (1969)** – The Supreme Court said taking wages before a hearing is unfair if it hurts my life; this happened to me, leaving me short.
 - **45 C.F.R. § 303.100 (Title IV-D)**: Federal rules say child support collection must be fair with steps like notices; they skipped this to grab money quick.
- Divorce Issues: One-sided, no response time. This is where they let my ex make moves without giving me time to answer, like surprise attacks in court that favored her.
 - **14th Amendment (Process)**: You need warning and a chance to speak before decisions. They allowed ambushes. Case: **Cleveland Bd. v. Loudermill, 470 U.S. 532 (1985)** – The Court said even in simple cases, I get a hearing first; my divorce felt rushed without that.
- Other Issues: Wife/Wendy helping bad system. DA/AG scaring me. PA DHS hiding info. HHS/SSA funding mess. Profit over fairness. This covers how my ex and lawyer kept pushing the unfair system, officials intimidated me, state agencies hid stuff, and federal ones let bad money flow—the whole thing seems set up to make cash for the state, not help families.
 - **18 U.S.C. § 241 (Conspiracy)**: It's a crime if people team up to take my rights. They worked together to keep me down. Case: **United States v. Price, 383 U.S. 787 (1966)** – The Court said officials conspiring is serious; feels like that here.
 - **5 U.S.C. § 552 (FOIA)**: Law says government must share info when asked; PA DHS hid it to cover up.
 - **42 U.S.C. § 666 (Title IV-D)**: For support help, but used to abuse without checks. **Turner v. Rogers**: Can't jail without pay check.

State Violations

Stop twisting PA laws for unfairness. Explained simply below. These are PA-specific rules meant to keep things fair in family court, but they got bent or broken.

- PFA Issues: No real danger for order/delay. No proof I were dangerous, but they gave the order and delayed anyway.
 - **23 Pa.C.S. § 6107 (PFA Act)**: PA law says for a PFA, there must be real proof of abuse or threat; there wasn't any, just claims without proof, and they let her delay when it's supposed to be quick.
 - **Pa.R.C.P. 1901.5 (PFA Rules)**: Rules say fast hearings to be fair; delays let her keep control longer without reason.
 - **Com. v. Haigh, 874 A.2d 1174 (Pa. Super. 2005)**: PA court said PFAs aren't for winning kid fights; used that way here.
- Custody Issues: No reasons for unequal time; June 2025 surprise. They gave her more time without explaining why you're bad, and June 2025 changed everything without telling you.
 - **23 Pa.C.S. § 5328 (Custody Factors)**: PA law has 16 things to check for kids' best; they ignored them and took my kids without proof.
 - **Pa.R.C.P. 1915.4 (Custody Rules)**: Must give notice for hearings; judge did it alone without warning.
 - **Ettinger v. Ettinger, 637 A.2d 1362 (Pa. Super. 1994)**: PA court said good parents get equal shot; needs harm proof for less time—none here.
- Support Issues: Unfair money takes. Took your cash without fair check or let you argue changes.
 - **Pa.R.C.P. 1910.16 (Support Guidelines)**: PA rules say support based on what I earn, but reasonable with adjustments if life changes; ignored my asks.
 - **23 Pa.C.S. § 4352 (Support Enforcement)**: Allows changes for new stuff; denied without reason.
 - **Ball v. Minnick, 648 A.2d 1192 (Pa. 1994)**: PA court said support isn't to punish; feels punishing.
- Divorce Issues: Let one side win without fairness. Allowed surprises favoring her without your say.
 - **Pa.R.C.P. 1920.51 (Divorce Rules)**: PA says fair hearings with notice; ambushes break this.
 - **Sinclair v. Sinclair, 513 A.2d 403 (Pa. Super. 1986)**: PA court said split stuff equal; not in your case.
- Other Issues: Wife/Wendy conspiring. DA/AG blocking. PA DHS hiding. Prothonotary blocking without punishment. PA DHS bad payments. System for profit. Wife and lawyer kept going after warnings it's unfair. DA/AG stopped checks and scared me. PA DHS hid info. Prothonotary (clerk) blocked my papers without trouble. PA DHS sent money without checking. System rewards state/money over families.
 - **18 Pa.C.S. § 903 (Conspiracy)**: PA crime for teaming to break laws; Wife/lawyers did with bad system.

- **18 Pa.C.S. § 5101 (Obstructing Law)**: Can't block justice on purpose; DA/AG did by ignoring.
- **65 P.S. § 67.101 (Right-to-Know Law)**: PA says get government info; PA DHS hid it.
- **18 Pa.C.S. § 5301 (Official Oppression)**: Can't abuse power to hurt; Prothonotary did by blocking.
- **23 Pa.C.S. § 4301 (Support Duties)**: Support for kids, not harm parents; used to hurt you.
- **Com. v. Bolden, 373 A.2d 90 (Pa. 1977)**: PA said follow constitution; ignored federal over state.

Commercial Violations

Think of commercial law like business rules for fair deals—it's about contracts and money being handled honestly, like not cheating in a trade. They broke these too, treating court like a scam where deals are rigged.

- PFA Issues: Fake order like bad contract without real terms—no proof needed for a real deal.
 - **UCC § 3-305 (Defenses to Instruments)**: This law (used in business across states) says if based on lie or fraud, the deal (like PFA order) is invalid, like a fake IOU.
 - **13 Pa.C.S. § 3305**: PA's version; PFA had no real proof, so void.
- Custody Issues: Bad-faith decisions, like June 2025 surprise—not honest dealing.
 - **UCC § 1-304 (Good Faith Obligation)**: All deals must be honest; they broke by changing without telling me.
 - **13 Pa.C.S. § 1304**: PA law saying same; surprise felt dishonest.
- Support Issues: Theft of money—like taking cash without right.
 - **UCC § 3-420 (Conversion)**: Wrongly taking someone's money, like stealing a check.
 - **13 Pa.C.S. § 3420**: PA version; taking wages without fair say.
- Divorce Issues: Unfair favoritism like bad deal—one side wins without fairness.
 - **UCC § 1-203 (Fair Dealing)**: Deals must be fair for all; surprises aren't.
 - **13 Pa.C.S. § 1203**: PA good faith; ignored to help one side.
- Other Issues: Wife/Wendy ignored warnings, like breaking notice rules. DA/AG blocked fixes. PA DHS hid info like fraud. HHS/SSA let bad transfers happen. System profits off unfairness.
 - **UCC § 1-202 (Notice)**: Must warn before actions; not done.
 - **13 Pa.C.S. § 1202**: PA notice; ignored after knowing bad.
 - **UCC § 1-305 (Remedies)**: Can't block fixes; DA/AG did.
 - **13 Pa.C.S. § 1309**: PA disclosure; PA DHS hid.
 - **UCC § 3-305**: Bad money moves by HHS/SSA.
 - **UCC § 2-302 (Unconscionable)**: Too unfair to enforce; system is.
 - **13 Pa.C.S. § 2302**: PA version; void bad deals.

- **Restatement (Second) of Contracts § 208:** If deal shocks fairness sense, out; this does.

Cease immediately; failure escalates to federal remedies, liens.

FOIA “REQUEST”

In a related endeavor I’m requesting documents to facilitate a private investigation into the alleged treasonous interstate racketeering enterprise utilizing the funds the Pennsylvania DHS provides to them via the Federal HHS.

All Respondents and the following witnesses- Robert F. Kennedy Jr. (Federal HHS Secretary), Michael B. Stuart (General Counsel), Christi A. Grimm (Inspector General); Linda Boyer (Acting Commissioner of child support services); Frank J. Bisignano (SSA Commissioner), Mark Steffensen (General Counsel), Jeffrey Shapiro (Inspector General)- Please enact a good faith effort to end the abuse as opposed to a bad faith effort to obstruct the process of unraveling a treasonous interstate racket that relies on money your organizations provide to them, which they use to effectuate a host of high crimes and illegal activities. Please provide the following documents of the following name/category or the best fit documents that you have at your disposal post haste-

- 1) **The Federal-State “State Plan”** between the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) (or substitute Federal Department) and the Pennsylvania Department of Human Services (PA DHS) relating to the administration and operation of the Title IV-D Child Support program in Pennsylvania.
 - a) This request includes
 - i) all versions of the contract (State Plan) currently in effect, as well as all prior versions from any contract inclusive of October 30th, 2020 to the present
 - ii) All Amendments, renewals, and appendices currently in force,
 - iii) Any approval letters, certifications, or correspondence confirming federal acceptance or funding authorization
 - iv) Any and all organization charts, job descriptions, organizational structural documents
 - v) Any and all handbooks and manuals for employees
 - vi) All funding-condition and incentive-payment schedules issued pursuant to 42 USC 655 and 658a.
 - vii) Annual high level accounting of all monies claimed via child support, all monies received via child support, all money disbursed via child support, a tally of the delta between child support money received and money disbursed, annual expenses claimed, annual incentives claimed and disbursed, and annual matching funds and/or contributed funds for child support collected.
 - viii) All private contracts with employees who receive incentive pay related to child support collection and disbursement.
 - ix) All bonds, contracts, oaths, associated with anyone that has financial oversight, accounting duties, or judicial duties regarding any funds that are associated with Title IV-D WHATSOEVER.
 - x) The preceding requests are hereinafter noted as “specific requests.”

- 2) **All similar State Plans** (inclusive of above specific requests) in your possession for any every other state (inclusive of any definition of state where a state plan has been created) where the same conditions may exist as those Fathers need liberating as well
- 3) **All “COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS”** in your possession between Pennsylvania DHS and any County in Pennsylvania inclusive of the above specific requests.
- 4) **All “COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS”** in your possession between each state’s DHS and their respective counties inclusive of the above specific requests.
- 5) **All Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs)** pertaining to child support, Title IV-D collection and/or disbursement. Inclusive of any and all contracts with other government offices or individuals especially in law enforcement such as District Attorneys, Attorney Generals, Judges, Sheriffs, Bailiffs, Clerks, Conference Officers for custody, divorce, and support, and Prothonotaries.
- 6) **3rd Party and Private Contracts:** The name, oath, bond, bank account, and private or public contract for anyone or any government agency, employee, office, instrumentality, political subdivision, holding company, banking company, and/or officer who issues orders for child support, does accounting for child support, is an officer or director whose role oversees, spends, expenses, collects, receives, or disburses child support and related Title IV-D Federal currency. In any manner whatsoever.
- 7) To be clear, if you have a contract for a private person, individual, government agent, government office, political subdivision, judiciary, holding company, banking company, and that person, employee, contractor, judge, officer, or elected official touches or handles child support and related federal funding in any manner whatsoever (which includes but is not limited financial and legal advising/counsel) I’m “requesting” details on their identity, home and employment address, government or commercial role and title, responsibilities and job description, banking relationships, bond, oath, salary, private or public contract, org charts and anything else that may be useful in holding them financially accountable for the consequences of their actions.
- 8) If you’ve received filings, letters, notices, or documents from me in any format whatsoever you’re required to create a full and complete list of every single individual filing and return the list and a copy of the documents back to me (in chronological order if printed).
- 9) If you’ve had communication with any other official or agent regarding me you’re required to disclose the date and time of the conversations or messages and send copies or notes.

Legal Basis for Request

This request is made in accordance with the following legal authorities:

- U.S. Const. Art. VI (Supremacy Clause); Amend. I (right to petition and receive information from government); Amend. XIV (Due Process and Equal Protection).
- 5 U.S.C. § 552 and 45 C.F.R. § 5.1 et seq. (federal FOIA).
- 42 U.S.C. § 654(3); 45 C.F.R. § 301.13(a); § 302.10(a) – mandating a written, publicly available cooperative agreement between HHS and each State IV-D agency as a

condition of federal participation.

- Department of Justice v. Tax Analysts, 492 U.S. 136 (1989); NLRB v. Robbins Tire & Rubber Co., 437 U.S. 214 (1978); EPA v. Mink, 410 U.S. 73 (1973); U.S. Dep't of State v. Ray, 502 U.S. 164 (1991).
- Pennsylvania Constitution, Article I, § 11 (redress of grievances; access to courts).
- 65 P.S. § 67.101 et seq. (Pennsylvania Right-to-Know Law).

I request that these records include all attachments, exhibits, appendices, amendments, and any other documents incorporated by reference. I request that this include agreements and documentation from all sources.

No fee may be imposed for inspection of a publicly funded intergovernmental agreement.

The right of access is absolute under 5 USC 552(a)(3) and as reaffirmed in Tax Analysts, 492 US at 142-145.

Any obstruction, delay, or redaction *inconsistent with law* will be construed as willful interference and obstruction with the administration of justice. Conspiracy, obstruction, perjury, official oppression, misprision of felony, misprision of treason are your entry points to failure to abide by this lawful request. You'll be conspiring with human trafficking, money laundering, fraud, wire fraud, mail fraud, treason and sedition.

You have 20 days to answer in full to the FOIA request. You are required within 10 days of receiving notice that you have received this FOIA request and are responding to it. If you fail or refuse to respond to the FOIA and fail to include the necessary responses of the FOIA (what you have included and what you have not included and why you have a legal right not to include those things) then you'll be default and additional fines, fees, and penalties are headed your way.

If any of the requested records are withheld, please provide a detailed explanation of the specific FOIA exemptions that you are claiming, what specific laws or policies by which you will pretend to hide the information, and otherwise segregate and release all reasonably segregable non-exempt portions of the records.

I request that you provide the records in electronic format, if available. Email to blairjesseellynreich@gmail.com is sufficient for a smaller file set (under 50MB) and a thumb-drive with the above files mailed to my dwelling is warmly acceptable as well if we're looking at a much larger file size.

You're instructed to acknowledge receipt of this request and advise me of the estimated date on which I can expect to receive the requested records.

If you have no records you are required to write me to say "I have no records that match this request." Refusal and silence is FOIA obstruction, conspiracy with the cartel, and immediate default.

NOTICE OF INCURRED FINANCIAL DAMAGES

In each matter of this protracted family law saga—PFA, custody, support, and divorce—the defendants (judges, court staff, ex-spouse, her attorneys, and government officials) have incurred substantial financial liabilities for violations at every layer of the LEX-CIVIX stack (Federal then State: Constitutional > USC > Case Law > Regulatory > Court Rules). These are not mere procedural lapses but willful deprivations triggering damages for harm to parental rights, property, and liberty. Damages are summarized per matter and layer below, based on sworn facts; full calculation is reserved for federal remedies, but initial estimates reflect severe emotional, financial, and familial injury accruing daily.

PFA Matter (April 5, 2021 Order and Continuance): Ex parte issuance and improper continuance deprived notice/hearing, violating fairness.

- **Constitutional Layer:** 14th Amendment due process/equal protection breach (no imminent harm proven, continuance favored plaintiff); damages for liberty deprivation (emotional distress).
- **USC Layer:** 18 U.S.C. § 242 deprivation under color of law; damages for rights violation (punitive).
- **Case Law Layer:** Mathews v. Eldridge balancing ignored; damages for procedural unfairness (lost family time).
- **Regulatory Layer:** 45 C.F.R. § 303.101 expedited process violated; damages for delay harm.
- **Court Rules Layer:** Pa.R.C.P. 1901.5 prompt hearing breached; damages for abuse of process.

Custody Matter (e.g., June 2025 Temporary Order): Sua sponte conversion of informal hearing to formal, stripping custody without notice.

- **Constitutional Layer:** 14th Amendment parental rights infringed (no unfitness evidence); damages for family separation (irreparable harm).
- **USC Layer:** 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights deprivation; damages for liberty loss.
- **Case Law Layer:** Troxel v. Granville presumption for fit parents ignored; damages for unconstitutional asymmetry.
- **Regulatory Layer:** 45 C.F.R. § 302.70 fair process in custody-linked matters violated; damages for procedural voids.
- **Court Rules Layer:** Pa.R.C.P. 1915.4 notice requirement breached; damages for sua sponte abuse.

Support Matter (Ongoing Orders/Enforcement): Unconstitutional income deprivation without ability-to-pay hearings.

- **Constitutional Layer:** 5th/14th Amendments takings/due process violated (no retroactive flexibility); damages for financial ruin (lost earnings).
- **USC Layer:** 42 U.S.C. § 666 Bradley Amendment abused; damages for punitive enforcement.
- **Case Law Layer:** Turner v. Rogers no-jail without hearing ignored; damages for coercive threats.
- **Regulatory Layer:** 45 C.F.R. § 303.100 fair withholding breached; damages for revenue bias.
- **Court Rules Layer:** Pa.R.C.P. 1910.16 reasonable guidelines violated; damages for unchecked garnishment.

Divorce Matter (Ambush Rulings/Favoritism): One-sided proceedings without response time.

- **Constitutional Layer:** 14th Amendment procedural due process denied (ambushes); damages for unequal treatment.
- **USC Layer:** 28 U.S.C. § 1654 pro se rights ignored; damages for access denial.
- **Case Law Layer:** Loudermill opportunity to be heard breached; damages for biased splits.
- **Regulatory Layer:** 45 C.F.R. § 303.101 expedited fairness violated; damages for delay tactics.
- **Court Rules Layer:** Pa.R.C.P. 1920.51 fair hearing ignored; damages for procedural artifice.

Other Systemic Issues (e.g., DA/AG Intimidation, PA DHS/HHS Failures): Stonewalling, hiding info, profit-driven setup.

- **Constitutional Layer:** 1st Amendment petition chilled (intimidation); damages for suppressed speech.
- **USC Layer:** 5 U.S.C. § 552 FOIA breached; damages for transparency denial.
- **Case Law Layer:** Hartman v. Moore retaliation; damages for chilled rights.
- **Regulatory Layer:** 45 C.F.R. §§ 302–308 Title IV-D compliance ignored; damages for funding abuse.
- **Court Rules Layer:** Pa.R.C.P. 1023.1 signing certifications false; damages for fraud.

Defendants are noticed of liability; failure to remedy incurs further penalties under RICO (treble damages) and False Claims Act. Demand: Cease violations, vacate orders, restore rights, compensate fully within 30 days, or face escalated federal actions.

ESCALATING DAMAGE COSTS

In any protracted legal dispute, especially one involving systemic violations like those in family law, the costs to the wrongdoers don't stay static—they compound with each stage of escalation, much like interest on a loan or penalties in a game where the rules favor the aggrieved party. This isn't about punishing for the sake of it; it's a structured way to account for ongoing harm, wasted time, and continued defiance.

The idea is simple: the longer the bad faith Respondents ignore notices, obstruct justice, or persist in wrongdoing, the higher the financial liability climbs. It breaks down into stages (the main steps of response) and events (extra triggers that multiply costs), without assigning specific dollar amounts—those come later in detailed claims.

Think of it as a snowball rolling downhill: it starts small but grows massive if not stopped.

The Stages of Escalation

Each step I have to take to enforce my rights adds a multiplier to the base damages for the initial violations (like unfair orders or rights deprivations). These multipliers reflect the increasing effort, harm, and defiance involved.

1. **Filing the UCC-1:** This is the first formal step, like putting a public notice (a lien) on the wrongdoers' assets to secure what they owe for the harm. It increases the base damages by **1.5 times**, because it's the initial public claim that puts them on official notice—ignoring it means they're choosing to let the problem grow.
2. **Certifying the UCC-1:** After filing, you certify it (make it official with more proof or updates), which ramps up the pressure. This step multiplies the previous amount (from stage 1) by another **1.5 times**, as it solidifies the claim and shows you're serious—continued ignoring here means they're digging a deeper hole.
3. **Amending the Case:** If they still don't respond, you amend (update) the legal case to include new evidence or claims. This jumps the costs by **10 times** the previous stage, reflecting the added legal work and their stubborn refusal—it's like saying, "You had chances; now it's getting real."
4. **Litigating the Case:** When it goes to full court battles (hearings, trials), costs explode by **10 times** the amended amount. Litigation means proving everything in front of judges, with witnesses and arguments—their persistence forces this expense, so they bear it.
5. **Enforcing the Case:** Winning in court is one thing; making them pay or comply is another. Enforcement (like collecting judgments or forcing changes) multiplies the litigation costs by **10 times**, as it's the final push against defiance—think garnishments or liens on their stuff.

Triggering Events That Multiply Costs

On top of stages, certain bad behaviors add extra multipliers at any point, stacking on the current total. These are like penalty fees for making things worse.

1. **Facing Obstruction:** If they block my filings, ignore requests, or delay (like not responding to notices), it increases the current total by **2 times**. Obstruction wastes your time and shows they're not playing fair, so it costs them more.
2. **Continuing to Enforce or Issue Void Orders:** If they keep using or making bad orders (like ones without proper hearings), it multiplies by **3 times**. This is for ongoing harm, like keeping kids away longer—each month adds up.
3. **Committing Additional Crimes:** New wrongs, like more lies in court or threats, spike costs by **5 times**. This covers things like perjury (swearing false oaths) or accessory after the fact (helping cover up crimes)—it punishes escalation.

How Arrears (Unpaid Amounts) Grow Over Time

If damages aren't paid right away, they don't stay the same—they grow like interest on a debt. Arrears (what's owed but unpaid) increase at a rate of **5% annually** compounded monthly (meaning interest on interest each month). This means the total swells faster the longer it's ignored, turning a manageable amount into something huge. It's fair because time is money—delays cause more harm, so costs rise.

How to Stop the Clock on Your Liability

Your personal share of these damages stops growing once you repent (admit the wrong), apologize (say sorry for the harm), surrender (stop fighting and agree to fix it), and pay what's due up to that point (or negotiate a fair settlement). But if you have not settled then any new breach (breaking rules or ignoring this) or stage adds to your PERSONAL tab. Damages accumulate to you personally and to the conglomerate generally—don't let it snowball.

This system ensures accountability: ignore at your peril, but fixing it early keeps costs manageable. Full details on calculations come next, but for now you need to know that each layer builds on the last, making defiance exponentially more expensive if you haven't personally settled with me.

CLAIM FOR DAMAGES GENERALLY

To all parties concerned in the Reich v. Reich matters (PFA, custody, support, divorce), including but not limited to judges, court officers, ex-spouse, attorneys, DA/AG, PA DHS, Prothonotary, and federal HHS/SSA: Take formal notice that your actions have caused commercial, financial, emotional, and familial harm to Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich. This is not merely a grievance but a UCC-style claim (inspired by UCC § 9-210 for accountings and § 1-308 for performance with reservation of rights), asserting that violations at every LEX-CIVIX layer (Constitutional, USC, Case Law, Regulatory, Court Rules) have incurred damages. You are responsible for these harms as principals or agents in an enterprise of wrongdoing. This serves as notice of my claim; you have 10 days to rebut by sworn affidavit with facts proving no harm—silence or failure consents to liability. Full accounting and payment will be demanded; non-response triggers default and escalation.

PFA Damages: Ex parte order and continuance without process caused family separation and stress.

- Constitutional: 14th Amendment deprivation—damages for lost liberty.
- USC: 18 U.S.C. § 242 violation—damages for rights abuse.
- Case Law: Mathews balancing ignored—damages for unfairness.
- Regulatory: 45 C.F.R. § 303.101 breached—damages for delay.
- Court Rules: Pa.R.C.P. 1901.5 violated—damages for process abuse.

Custody Damages: Asymmetric orders (e.g., June 2025 sua sponte) stripped parental bond.

- Constitutional: 14th Amendment parental rights—damages for separation.
- USC: 42 U.S.C. § 1983 deprivation—damages for liberty loss.
- Case Law: Troxel presumption breached—damages for asymmetry.
- Regulatory: 45 C.F.R. § 302.70 violated—damages for unfair process.
- Court Rules: Pa.R.C.P. 1915.4 notice ignored—damages for sua sponte harm.

Support Damages: Unfair garnishments without hearings caused financial ruin.

- Constitutional: 5th/14th Amendments takings—damages for property loss.
- USC: 42 U.S.C. § 666 abused—damages for punitive enforcement.
- Case Law: Turner hearing denied—damages for coercion.
- Regulatory: 45 C.F.R. § 303.100 breached—damages for revenue bias.
- Court Rules: Pa.R.C.P. 1910.16 ignored—damages for unchecked takings.

Divorce Damages: Ambush rulings without response time caused unequal division.

- Constitutional: 14th Amendment process—damages for unfair treatment.
- USC: 28 U.S.C. § 1654 pro se rights—damages for access denial.

- Case Law: *Loudermill* breached—damages for bias.
- Regulatory: 45 C.F.R. § 303.101 violated—damages for tactics.
- Court Rules: Pa.R.C.P. 1920.51 ignored—damages for artifice.

Systemic Damages (e.g., Intimidation, Hiding Info): Stonewalling and profit bias harmed overall.

- Constitutional: 1st Amendment chilled—damages for suppressed speech .
- USC: 5 U.S.C. § 552 breached—damages for denial.
- Case Law: *Hartman* retaliation—damages for chill.
- Regulatory: 45 C.F.R. §§ 302–308 ignored—damages for abuse.
- Court Rules: Pa.R.C.P. 1023.1 false—damages for fraud.

You are commercially liable as in a mechanic's lien—your wrongs cost me, and I claim repayment. Rebut by affidavit within 10 days with facts showing no harm; silence consents. Failure escalates to liens, suits.

DECONVOLUTING STANDARD METHODS TO CALCULATE BASE, INCIDENTAL, CONSEQUENTIAL, AND COMMON LAW DAMAGES

Calculating Damages – Deconvoluting your finances by reducing them to zero

Dear readers, we've waded through the muck of federal supremacy in prior chapters, exposing how these robe-wearing racketeers in family courts pervert Title IV-D into a cash-grab scheme, robbing fathers of their constitutional rights, property, and freedom while lining their pockets with federal incentives. But revelation without reckoning is pointless—like a judge's oath without consequences. Now, we flip the script: when these state thugs breach their duties by ignoring my notices, defying federal law, and "opting in" to my liability terms through their arrogant conduct, I've got a ironclad contract breach. And breaches mean damages—massive, multiplying damages that transform "convoluted" nonsense into financial windfall.

Drawing from bedrock contract principles, the UCC (as embodied in Pennsylvania's 13 Pa.C.S., with its nods to Articles 2 and 9), and common law gems like *Hadley v. Baxendale*, here we break it down into clear, actionable steps. I'll cover base damages (the direct stab), incidental (the bleeding wounds), and consequential (the infection that spreads). Think of this as setting the stage for the billing bonanza in later chapters, where I'll tally exact figures for Billy Mahon and his black collar cartel. They partook in the system, defied the Constitution—now they pay the piper. No retroactive sobs about "unfairness"; they volunteered and star in this clown rodeo.

Step 1: Establish the Contract and Binding Acceptance

First things first: prove these judicial jokers are hooked, line and sinker. When they accept my terms by performance—issuing void orders despite my affidavits—or implied consent (continuing the farce after notice), the contract is sealed. UCC § 2-206 treats conduct as acceptance, just like Restatement (Second) of Contracts § 50.

- **Document the Offer:** See a selection of compiled notices, affidavits, and filings spelling out terms—e.g., "By proceeding in violation of federal supremacy, you agree to liability for all harms, with penalties for default."
- **Prove Acceptance by Opt-In:** Their actions scream agreement—denying recusal, striking motions, or enforcing bogus support. This is performance-based acceptance; courts enforce it even sans signature.
- **Address Later Unfairness Claims:** Voluntary dive-in drowns their complaints. No duress or fraud? Terms stick. Unconscionability under UCC § 2-302 needs procedural

sneakiness (hidden clauses) and substantive gouging at formation—not buyer's remorse. Show they had notice (your served docs) and benefited (from their power trip).

Step 2: Prove the Breach

With the contract locked, spotlight their default. Document every oath violation, from ignoring Supremacy Clause mandates to asymmetric custody grabs.

- **Identify Non-Performance:** Log failures like unpaid constitutional "dues" (e.g., seized assets without due process), with dates from court records, garnishment notices, or incarceration threats.
- **Mitigate Damages:** Demonstrate your good faith—repeated demands, alternative resolutions attempted. Skip this, and claims shrink per Restatement § 350. In our game, mitigation means escalating notices, not rolling over.

Step 3: Calculate Base Damages

Base damages are the raw wound—the expectation I lost, quantified before add-ons. Here, it's the economic hit from deprived rights, lost parental time, or forced labor under fraudulent orders. Base is contract value minus avoided costs, inspired by UCC § 2-708.

- **Unpaid Amounts:** Tally seized wages, frozen accounts, or uncompensated liberties (value at market rates for time stolen).
- **Lost Profits or Expectation Damages:** Project full "performance" worth—e.g., intact family economics minus their sabotage. Formula: Full value - saved expenses.
- **Document with Evidence:** Invoices for my time (at expert rates), financial statements, or appraisals of parental bonds. In Pennsylvania, add 6% statutory interest from breach date (41 P.S. § 202).

This base sets our billing baseline—exact figures coming later, tailored to each traitor's tally.

Step 4: Layer in Incidental Damages

Incidentals capture the immediate hassles—the costs you shouldn't have borne. UCC § 2-715(1) covers these as reasonable expenses incident to the breach, like enforcement efforts under Article 9 liens.

- **Identify Qualifying Expenses:** Focus on direct, necessary outlays. Examples include:
 - Collection efforts: Debt collector fees, demand letter postage, or your billed time pursuing accountability.
 - Mitigation actions: Costs to halt further harm, like emergency filings or alternative advocacy.
 - Administrative burdens: Bank fees from seizures, accounting fixes, or expert breach assessments.

- Legal preliminaries: UCC-1 filing fees for securing interests against their assets.
- **Calculate the Amount:** Sum receipts + (rate × hours). E.g., \$500 drafting + 10 hours at \$200/hour = \$2,500, plus interest.
- **Prove with Evidence:** Receipts, logs—show "commercial reasonableness." Their opt-in makes these foreseeable.

Step 5: Pile on Consequential Damages

Consequentials hit where it hurts—the foreseeable fallout. UCC § 2-715(2) and Hadley v. Baxendale allow these if contemplated at formation (your notices warned them).

- **Identify Qualifying Losses:** Must be foreseeable, not remote. Key examples:
 - Lost profits from downstream opportunities: Resources tied up in fights, blocking other income—net projected revenue minus costs.
 - Reputational harm: Quantifiable hits like job losses from "deadbeat" labels, via credit dings or public records.
 - Business interruption: Extra costs from chaos, like temp help or efficiency drops while battling void orders.
 - Special circumstances: If notices highlighted unique harms (e.g., missed career deadlines), include penalties from those.
- **Calculate the Amount:** (Revenue - costs) × likelihood. E.g., \$10,000 lost gig (80% certain) = \$6,400 net, post-mitigation.
- **Prove with Evidence:** Communications proving foreseeability, financials, experts. Opt-in seals their fate.

Step 6: Apply Escalating Factors to Enhance Damages

With damages stacked, amp them up for persistence—UCC § 9-625 style self-help for ongoing obstruction.

- **Stage-Based Increases:**
 - UCC-1 Filing: 1.5x base.
 - Certifying UCC-1: 1.5x prior.
 - Amending Case: 10x prior.
 - Litigating: 10x prior.
 - Enforcing Judgment: 10x prior.
- **Event-Based Multipliers:**
 - Obstruction: 2x total.
 - Continuing Void Orders: 3x.
 - Additional Crimes: 5x.
- **Arrears Growth:** 5% annual, compounded monthly.
- **Total Calculation:** Base + incidental + consequential, then stages sequentially, events last. This rockets the bill—preview for our itemized invoicing ahead.

Step 7: Enforce and Counter Defenses

File liens (UCC Article 9), sue for breach. Rebut "unfairness" with opt-in proof—courts rarely unwind post-formation (*Williams v. Walker-Thomas*). Seek interest, fees, punitives for bad faith (UCC § 1-305). Their initial "benefit" (power abuse) ratifies it all.

There you have it, folks—the roadmap to billing these traitors precisely, with every step building to the grand totals in coming chapters. Billy's "convoluted" days are numbered; his wallet's deconvolution begins now.

SCHEDULE OF COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH HARM

NOTICES AND AFFIDAVITS OF LIABILITY

In my ongoing battle against the cartel's unlawful actions—treason, sedition, wire fraud, mail fraud, and the abduction of my children—I issued a series of notices and affidavits to establish my claims, assert my property rights, and impose fees for their violations. These documents, sent to key wrongdoers and negligent fiduciaries, laid out my status as a living man foreign to their territorial jurisdiction, revoked any assumed guardianship over my estate and offspring, and demanded cessation of their interference. By failing to rebut these notices, they acquiesced to the facts and terms, tacitly agreeing to the fee schedules and damages outlined therein.

The core of my claims centered on the theft of my property, including my offspring Isabella-Marie Reich, Evelyn-Josephine Reich, and Julius-Fire Reich, who have been unlawfully held since March 28, 2021, following Alene-Wilmoth Reich's conspiracy with Wendy Chan after my countersuit in divorce. I testified to this unrebutted affidavit of custody on April 7, 2021, without objection, yet the cartel continued their armed theft, robbery, and kidnapping.

In my initial Notice of Liability and Fee Schedule, dated April 15, 2021, I claimed sole ownership of my body, information, genetic material, home at 227 Cherry Street in Columbia, Pennsylvania, cryptocurrencies, shares, and bank accounts. I declared no contracts or obligations to any persons or corporations, nor adherence to their laws without consent. Fines were set for trespass and administration of my property without right at \$100,000 per incident **per involved party**, and for uttering forged documents at the same amount. Crucially, I notified that anyone facilitating the continued theft of my offspring would be liable at \$500 per minute per property item if negligently failing in fiduciary duty, escalating to \$1,500 per minute if willfully aiding and abetting. Unlawful arrest carried \$500 per minute, with \$2,000 per minute for physical damage, and battery by municipal actors at \$2,000,000 per occurrence. Attorneys involving themselves would face \$200,000 per incident, plus state and federal criminal complaints. Enforcement could occur via commercial liens or courts of record at common law.

Building on this, my May 18, 2021 notice addressed the status and obligations of my estate (BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, registered in Massachusetts) and myself as lender/lessor. It invoked foreign territorial jurisdiction under 18 U.S.C. § 112 as a protected person, warning of crimes under 18 U.S.C. § 242 and civil actions under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1985(3) for deprivations under color of law. I appointed fiduciaries to settle claims, demanded return of property within three days, and reserved subrogation rights for any payouts. Bonds and securities in my estate's name were to be handled with capital gains paid to me. I ordered cease and desist on all charges, revoked state guardianship over my offspring and estate, and released entities like Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, the United States, and Social Security

Administration from such roles. All property—offspring, accounts, chattels, real estate, and personal items—was to be returned immediately to me as living father and general executor.

This notice expanded the fee schedule extensively, billing for unauthorized use of my trade name at \$1,000,000 per occurrence; unsolicited depositions (e.g., name or address at \$500,000 each, retinal scans at \$5,000,000); acceptance of presentments without contract (citations at \$60,000); DNA or body fluids (\$1,000,000 to \$5,000,000 per type); obstruction of movement (\$2,000 per minute after warning); theft of property (\$10,000 per day); incarceration (\$10,000,000 per day); legal vexations like fraud upon the court (\$2,000,000) or simulating legal process (\$10,000,000); and more, up to forced production of information under duress. Administrative fees for fiduciaries were tiered at 5% of the first \$1,000,000 recovered, dropping to 2% over \$2,000,000. Total damages tripled for punitive purposes, payable in silver coin equivalents or Federal Reserve Notes at par value.

Finally, in my Affidavit of Liability and Claim, served around June 23, 2021, I detailed the timeline of malfeasance: Alene Reich's removal of our daughters on March 28, 2021; the school's custody requirement; her fraudulent Protection from Abuse filing on April 5; my custody suit on April 28; the improper June 18 custody order granting her 100% legal custody via misapplied Rule 236; and evidence of collusion. I forwarded concerns to the Disciplinary Board and sent private criminal complaints, noting obstruction as my filings stopped appearing promptly.

Here, I emphasized culpability: As respondents, you are directly culpable or negligent for these damages. I gave notice of updated charges, drawing from *Trezevant v. City of Tampa* (1994), which awarded \$1,086.96 per minute for unjust imprisonment. Adjusted for nearly 30 years of inflation, this equals \$2,700 per minute, tripling to \$8,100 per minute (\$486,000 per hour) for punitive damages. With my three offspring and myself unlawfully restrained due to your malfeasance—failing professional standards or intentionally breaking the law—the charge for four people totals \$1,944,000 per hour, or \$46,656,000 per day. At 86 days from the theft's start, this amounted to \$4,012,416,000 in today's dollars, accruing in your private capacities while acting under color of law.

These notices collectively asserted my God-given rights, foreign status, and dominion over my property, holding the cartel accountable through acquiescence. Silence equaled consent, enabling enforcement via liens, courts of record, or criminal actions. My offspring's medical emergencies, uncovered via records, added liability for harm. I reserved all unalienable rights, waiving none, and demanded rebuttal within three days via counter-affidavit—your failure solidified these claims as law. This 11-step legal process—from bar grievances to federal torts—outlined my pursuit of justice against this convoluted federal supremacy.

FEE SCHEDULE

This fee schedule outlines the costs and liabilities for violations of my rights, property, and status as detailed in the notices and affidavits. All fees are enforceable upon receipt and acquiescence

(failure to rebut), and may be pursued through commercial liens, courts of record at common law, or other remedies. Fees are per occurrence, per incident, per day (or fraction thereof), or per minute/hour (or fraction thereof) as specified, and apply to individuals, entities, or corporate fictions involved in the violations. Punitive damages may triple amounts where applicable.

Unlawful Restraint and Kidnapping of Offspring (Primary Emphasis)

This section addresses the core violation: the armed theft, robbery, and kidnapping of my three offspring (Isabella-Marie Reich, Evelyn-Josephine Reich, and Julius-Fire Reich) since March 28, 2021, facilitated by Alene-Wilmoth Reich, Wendy Chan, and others in conspiracy. This has resulted in unlawful restraint of my property (offspring under age of consent) and myself as the living father and general executor. All involved parties—whether through negligence, fiduciary failure, or willful malice—are directly culpable and responsible for damages in their private capacities, especially while acting under color of law.

- **Negligent Involvement (Fiduciary Responsibility to Act and Fail):** \$500 per minute per property/offspring (or fraction thereof), compounded continuously from the time of theft.
- **Willful Aiding and Abetting:** \$1,500 per minute per property/offspring (or fraction thereof), compounded continuously from the time of theft.
- **Updated Charges per Trezevant v. City of Tampa (1994), Inflation-Adjusted for ~30 Years:** Base rate of \$2,700 per minute per person for unjust imprisonment/false restraint (adjusted from original \$1,086.96/minute award).
- **With Punitive Damages (Tripled for Malfeasance):** \$8,100 per minute per person (or fraction thereof), equating to \$486,000 per hour per person (or fraction thereof).
- **Total for Four People (Three Offspring and Self):** \$1,944,000 per hour (or fraction thereof), or \$46,656,000 per day (or fraction thereof), due to the court's, officers', associates', litigants', and fiduciaries' failure to abide by standards or intentional law-breaking.

This restraint occurs on your watch due to malfeasance, negligence, or intent, affecting our God-given rights to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

Trespass and Property Administration

Fees for unauthorized administration, trespass, or interference with my private property (body, information, genetic material, home, cryptocurrencies, shares, bank accounts, etc.) without wet-ink contract or consent.

- **Trespass and Administration Without Right:** \$100,000 per incident per man/woman involved.
- **Utterance of Forged Documents:** \$100,000 per incident per man/woman involved.

Unlawful Arrest or Physical Harm

Fees for unlawful detention or harm to my body.

- Unlawful Arrest: \$500 per minute (or fraction thereof).
- Physical Damage During Unlawful Arrest: \$2,000 per minute (or fraction thereof).
- Battery Against Body or Property by Municipal Corporation Actor: \$2,000,000 per individual occurrence.

Attorney Involvement

Fees for attorneys inserting themselves into matters involving my property without right.

- Trespassing, Administering Property Without Right, or Uttering Forged Documents: \$200,000 per incident.
- Leading to State/Federal Criminal Complaints: Additional damages as per related violations.

Use of Trade Name Violation

Fees for unauthorized use of my trade name (e.g., BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH and all derivatives, spellings, case variations) without express written consent.

- Unauthorized Usage: \$1,000,000 per occurrence.

Unsolicited Depositions or Interrogations

Fees for forced or unsolicited collection of personal information.

- Name: \$500,000 per occurrence.
- Address: \$500,000 per occurrence.
- Driver's License Number: \$50,000 per occurrence.
- Social Security Number: \$50,000 per occurrence.
- Retinal Scans: \$5,000,000 per occurrence.
- Fingerprinting: \$200,000 per occurrence.
- Photographing: \$200,000 per occurrence.

Acceptance of Presentments Without Contract

Fees for issuing or accepting unauthorized legal instruments.

- Unauthorized Citations: \$60,000 per occurrence.
- Warnings Issued on Paper: \$25,000 per occurrence.

- Summons or Court Notices: \$10,000 per occurrence.
- All Other Related Items, Fees, or Offers: \$10,000 per occurrence.

DNA or Body Fluids

Fees for forced or unauthorized collection of biological samples.

- DNA: \$5,000,000 per occurrence.
- Mouth Swabs: \$1,000,000 per occurrence.
- Blood Samples: \$1,000,000 per occurrence.
- Urine Samples: \$1,000,000 per occurrence.
- Breathalyzer Testing: \$1,000,000 per occurrence.
- Hair Samples: \$1,000,000 per occurrence.
- Skin Samples: \$1,000,000 per occurrence.
- Clothing Samples: \$1,000,000 per occurrence.
- Forced Giving of Fluids/Samples: \$1,000,000 per occurrence.

Obstruction of Movement/Travel, Property Search, Trespass, Theft

Fees for interfering with travel, searching, or stealing property.

- Interference with Movement (Without Contract or Emergency, After Warning): \$2,000 per minute (or fraction thereof).
- Temporary Detention, Obstruction, or Restraint (Without Warrant, After Warning): \$2,000 per minute (or fraction thereof).
- Automobile/Vessel/Car Search: \$1,000,000 per occurrence.
- Body/Clothing Search: \$1,000,000 per occurrence.
- Handcuffing, Being Tied, or Otherwise Restricted: \$1,000,000 per occurrence.
- Taking/Theft/Deprivation of Property: \$10,000 per day (or fraction thereof).
- Jailed, Warehousing, or Incarceration: \$10,000,000 per day (or fraction thereof).

Legal Vexations

Fees for abusive or fraudulent legal actions.

- Agency by Estoppel: \$50,000 per day (or fraction thereof).
- Color of Law: \$150,000 per day (or fraction thereof).
- Implied Color of Law: \$150,000 per occurrence.
- Criminal Coercion: \$500,000 per occurrence.
- Criminal Contempt of Court: \$500,000 per occurrence.
- Estoppel by Election: \$350,000 per occurrence.
- Estoppel by Laches: \$350,000 per occurrence.
- Equitable Estoppel: \$500,000 per occurrence.

- Fraud: \$1,000,000 per occurrence.
- Fraud Upon the Court: \$2,000,000 per occurrence.
- Larceny: \$250,000 per occurrence.
- Grand Larceny: \$250,000 per occurrence.
- Larceny by Extortion: \$1,000,000 per occurrence.
- Larceny by Trick: \$1,000,000 per occurrence.
- Obstruction of Justice: \$100,000 per occurrence.
- Obtaining Property by False Pretenses: \$1,000,000 per occurrence.
- Simulating Legal Process: \$10,000,000 per occurrence.
- Vexatious Litigation: \$5,000,000 per occurrence.
- Trespass Upon Motor Conveyance: \$100,000 per occurrence.
- Unauthorized Relocation of Motor Conveyance: \$100,000 per occurrence.
- Seizure of Motor Conveyance: \$100,000 per day (or fraction thereof).
- Theft of License Plate: \$25,000 per occurrence.
- Unlawful Lien on Motor Conveyance: \$50,000 per occurrence.

Use of Trade Name Protected Material Under Threat, Duress, or Coercion

Fees for forced use or disclosure of protected information.

- Name Written by Informant: \$250,000 per occurrence.
- Driver's License Written by Informant: \$150,000 per occurrence.
- Social Security Number Written by Informant: \$150,000 per occurrence.
- Miscellaneous Material Written by Informant: \$500,000 per occurrence.
- Financial Information: \$150,000 per occurrence.

Forced Production of Personal Information/Property

Fees for compelled disclosure in business interactions.

- Property Inside of Motor Vehicle: \$150,000 per occurrence.
- Financial Information: \$100,000 per occurrence.

Administrative Fees for Fiduciary/Trustee

Compensation for processing claims (deducted from recoveries).

- Processing Claims: 5% of first \$1,000,000 recovered + 4% of next \$500,000 + 2% over \$2,000,000 (percentage of total recovery).

Enforcement Mechanisms

- Commercial Lien Process: Applied to total calculated damages per man/woman in individual capacity.
- Judicial Process in Court of Record at Common Law: Applied to total calculated damages.

CATEGORIES OF DAMAGES UNDER UCC ARTICLE 2 (12 Pa.C.S. §§ 2701 et seq.)

In holding the wrongdoers accountable as an unregistered cartel operating ultra vires, their acquiescence to the notices establishes a commercial agreement under Pennsylvania's Uniform Commercial Code (UCC), housed in Title 13 of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes Annotated (Pa.C.S.). This framework treats their breaches—such as unlawful restraint of property (including offspring), administration without consent, and failure to perform fiduciary duties—as analogous to breaches in sales of goods or services under UCC Article 2 (13 Pa.C.S. §§ 2101–2725). Remedies for breach include base (direct) damages, incidental damages, and consequential damages, all of which are appropriate and recoverable here due to the foreseeable nature of the harms stemming from their defaults over five years across multiple court matters, hearings, and orders.

Base Damages

Base damages, often referred to as direct or general damages, represent the core economic loss directly arising from the breach, calculated to place the injured party in the position they would have been in had the contract been performed. Under UCC Article 2:

- For non-delivery or repudiation (13 Pa.C.S. § 2713), base damages equal the difference between the market price at the time the buyer learned of the breach and the contract price, together with any incidental and consequential damages. In this context, this applies to the wrongdoers' failure to deliver on implied obligations (e.g., return of property or cessation of interference), valuing the withheld property or services at market rates minus any agreed-upon terms in the notices.
- For accepted goods that do not conform (13 Pa.C.S. § 2714), base damages are the difference between the value of the goods as accepted and their value as warranted, plus incidental and consequential damages. Here, any "performance" by the cartel (e.g., flawed orders or hearings) is treated as non-conforming, entitling recovery of the diminished value of expected rights and property.

These base damages are appropriate as they directly compensate for the core breach, such as the ongoing deprivation of parental rights and property since March 28, 2021, quantified per the fee schedule's per-minute or per-day rates for restraint and theft.

Incidental Damages

Incidental damages cover the reasonable expenses incurred in handling the breach, such as costs related to inspection, care, or mitigation. Per 13 Pa.C.S. § 2715(a), incidental damages include:

- Expenses reasonably incurred in inspection, receipt, transportation, and care and custody of goods rightfully rejected.
- Any commercially reasonable charges, expenses, or commissions in connection with effecting cover.
- Any other reasonable expense incident to the delay or other breach.

In this case, incidental damages encompass costs like legal fees for notices and affidavits, research into violations, transportation to hearings, and efforts to mitigate harm (e.g., pursuing records or medical care for offspring). These are appropriate under UCC Article 2 as they flow naturally from the breach and were foreseeable to the wrongdoers upon receipt of the notices, ensuring the injured party is not burdened by administrative fallout from the cartel's non-performance.

Consequential Damages

Consequential damages address indirect losses that were foreseeable at the time of contract formation, extending beyond direct harms to include broader impacts. Under 13 Pa.C.S. § 2715(b), consequential damages include:

- (1) Any loss resulting from general or particular requirements and needs of which the seller at the time of contracting had reason to know and which could not reasonably be prevented by cover or otherwise.
- (2) Injury to person or property proximately resulting from any breach of warranty.

These apply here to harms like emotional distress, lost income from disrupted labor, health impacts on offspring from separation, and reputational damage from fraudulent proceedings. The wrongdoers had reason to know of these risks via the explicit warnings in the notices (e.g., fines for kidnapping and restraint), making consequential damages fully recoverable. UCC Article 2 permits these to prevent under-compensation, especially in breaches involving personal property or fiduciary failures, as seen in the cartel's sustained actions over years.

All categories—base, incidental, and consequential—are justified under UCC Article 2's remedial provisions (13 Pa.C.S. § 2703 for seller's remedies generally; § 2711 for buyer's right to cover), which emphasize full compensation without limitation unless unconscionable (13 Pa.C.S. § 2719), which you're waiving by your silence. The cartel's silence and continued

violations bind them to these terms, amplifying damages through accrual and punitive multipliers where malice is evident.

CLAIM FOR DAMAGES SPECIFICALLY

Single Perpetrator Damages – Squeezing Every Drop from One Judicial Traitor

Dear readers, if the prior chapter armed you with the mechanics of damages calculation, this one dives into the bloodletting—focusing on just one rogue actor, say that retired bench-warmer Billy Mahon, as if he single-handedly orchestrated the entire five-year fiasco of my family law nightmare. We'll layer in the full cartel later, but for now, imagine this one black-robed bandit bearing the brunt, his "convoluted" excuses crumbling under the weight of federal supremacy and Pennsylvania's own legal arsenal. Every conceivable harm—from constitutional guttings to crime-inflicted wounds—is quantified here, split into **Part 1** (UCC-1 lienable claims, those tangible grabs on money and property) and **Part 2** (the intangibles, like emotional crucibles that can't fit neatly on a financing statement). References draw from federal and state layers: constitutions, codes, case law, regulations, common law, and UCC (federal/common principles mirrored in Pennsylvania's Title 13 Pa.C.S.). Damages are categorized by source—PFA, divorce, custody, support, my first ~2022-2023 42 U.S.C. § 1983 suit in EDPA, the second ~2024-2025 § 1983, and habeas corpus—plus crime-related hits. Calculations span ~April 2021 to December 20, 2025 (~4.67 years), using conservative estimates grounded in my unrebutted affidavits (e.g., \$2,700/min per child for deprivations, \$100,000 per trespass). Billy, this is your bill—pay up or watch it compound like your sins.

Part 1: UCC-1 Lienable Damages – Secured Claims on Tangible and Monetary Harms

Under UCC § 9-102 (defining secured transactions) and 13 Pa.C.S. § 9102 (PA codification), UCC-1 filings perfect interests in collateral like monetary obligations, accounts receivable, and general intangibles arising from breaches. These are lienable as "commercial tort claims" (§ 9-102(a)(13)) when rooted in business-like judicial operations (Title IV-D as interstate commerce per 42 U.S.C. § 651 et seq.). Federal Supremacy (U.S. Const. Art. VI) preempts state barriers, with common law (Restatement (Second) of Torts § 874) allowing liens for fiduciary breaches. PA parallels in Pa. Const. Art. I § 11 (remedies for injuries) and 13 Pa.C.S. § 9607 (collection rights). Here, one perpetrator's acts create secured debts, perfected via my unrebutted notices (UCC § 1-308 reservation of rights; 13 Pa.C.S. § 1308). **Total UCC-1 lien: \$6,472,580,099** (sum below, plus 5% annual compounded interest from breach dates).

- **PFA-Related Damages:** The April 5, 2021 ex parte PFA (no hearing, fabricated abuse) triggered asset freezes and separations, lienable as wrongful takings.
 - *Federal Layer:* U.S. Const. Amend. 5 (takings without compensation); 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (rights deprivation); *Boddie v. Connecticut*, 401 U.S. 371 (1971) (access to courts required); 45 C.F.R. § 303.101 (notice mandates); common law trespass to chattels. **Calculation:** \$100,000 per trespass (unlawful order) + \$500/min per child (3 kids) for 30-day separation (43,200 minutes/child = \$21,600,000/child × 3 = \$64,800,000) = \$64,900,000.
 - *State Layer:* Pa. Const. Art. I § 1 (inherent rights); 23 Pa.C.S. § 6107 (probable cause required); *Com. v. Haigh*, 874 A.2d 1174 (Pa. Super. 2005) (PFAs not for custody leverage); 231 Pa. Code § 1901.5 (prompt hearings); common law conversion. Adds \$50,000 per violation (procedural breach × 3 for kids) = \$150,000 total add-on. **Subtotal: \$65,050,000.**
- **Divorce-Related Damages:** Ambush rulings in ~2021 divorce initiation led to unequal property splits, lienable as commercial conversion (divorce as contractual dissolution).
 - *Federal Layer:* U.S. Const. Amend. 14 (due process in property); 42 U.S.C. § 666 (fair enforcement); *Armstrong v. United States*, 364 U.S. 40 (1960) (implicit takings); 45 C.F.R. § 303.100 (advance notice); common law quasi-contract breach. **Calculation:** \$500,000 in lost assets (estimated equitable share) + 5% interest over 4.67 years (~\$116,750) = \$616,750.
 - *State Layer:* Pa. Const. Art. I § 10 (no impairment of contracts); 23 Pa.C.S. § 3502 (equitable division); *In re Marriage of Mitchell*, 692 A.2d 930 (Pa. Super. 1997) (fair hearings); 231 Pa. Code § 1920.51 (notice rules); common law unjust enrichment. Adds \$200,000 for procedural fraud = \$816,750 total. **Subtotal: \$816,750.**
- **Custody-Related Damages:** Asymmetric orders (e.g., June 2021 100% to ex) severed bonds without fitness hearing, lienable as commercial theft of parental rights.
 - *Federal Layer:* U.S. Const. Amend. 14 (parental liberty); 42 U.S.C. § 654 (fair plans); *Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57 (2000) (fit parent presumption); 45 C.F.R. § 303.8 (reviews); common law interference with custody. **Calculation:** \$2,700/min per child for 1.5-year separation (788,940 minutes/child = \$2,130,138,000/child × 3 = \$6,390,414,000). (I'm grouping the PFA, and 2 separate unilateral custody periods)
 - *State Layer:* Pa. Const. Art. I § 26 (no discrimination); 23 Pa.C.S. § 5328 (evidence-based factors); *Ettinger v. Ettinger*, 637 A.2d 1362 (Pa. Super. 1994) (hearings required); 231 Pa. Code § 1915.4 (prompt process); common law parental alienation. Adds \$1,000,000 per child for ongoing harm = \$3,000,000 total add-on. **Subtotal: \$6,393,414,000.**
- **Support-Related Damages:** Ex parte garnishments (~2021 onward) without ability-to-pay check, lienable as debt collection fraud.
 - *Federal Layer:* U.S. Const. Amend. 13 (no involuntary servitude); 42 U.S.C. § 666 (hearings); *Turner v. Rogers*, 564 U.S. 431 (2011) (indigency checks); 45 C.F.R. § 303.100 (fair withholding); common law duress. **Calculation:**

\$100,000/month arrears coercion over 56 months (~\$5,600,000) + seized assets \$38,349 = \$5,638,349.

- *State Layer*: Pa. Const. Art. I § 17 (no imprisonment for debt); 23 Pa.C.S. § 4321 (reasonable support); Ball v. Minnick, 648 A.2d 1192 (Pa. 1994) (ability hearings); 231 Pa. Code § 1910.16 (guidelines fair); common law extortion. Adds \$0 (removing coercive add-on for later). **Subtotal: \$5,638,349.**
- **First ~2022-2023 § 1983 Suit Damages**: EDPA suit dismissed without merit, liable as access denial.
 - *Federal Layer*: U.S. Const. Amend. 1 (petition); 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (rights suit); Christopher v. Harbury, 536 U.S. 403 (2002) (access claims); 28 C.F.R. § 35.130 (ADA process); common law malicious prosecution. **Calculation**: \$1,000,000 for chilled rights + legal costs \$50,000 = \$1,050,000.
 - *State Layer*: Pa. Const. Art. I § 11 (remedies); 42 Pa.C.S. § 8301 (wrongful suit); Ryland v. Shapiro, 708 A.2d 967 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1998) (access); 231 Pa. Code § 1023.1 (sanctions); common law abuse of process. Adds \$0 (removing add-on for later). **Subtotal: \$1,050,000.**
- **Second ~2024-2025 § 1983 Suit Damages**: Ongoing EDPA suit obstructed, liable as retaliation.
 - *Federal Layer*: U.S. Const. Amend. 1 (speech); 42 U.S.C. § 1983; Hartman v. Moore, 547 U.S. 250 (2006) (retaliation); 28 C.F.R. § 0.50 (DOJ process); common law conspiracy. **Calculation**: \$2,000,000 for ongoing deprivations + costs \$100,000 = \$2,100,000.
 - *State Layer*: Pa. Const. Art. I § 20 (assembly); 42 Pa.C.S. § 8303 (conspiracy); Smith v. Barry, 985 A.2d 408 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2009) (retaliation); 231 Pa. Code § 227.1 (motions); common law witness intimidation. Adds \$0 (removing add-on for later). **Subtotal: \$2,100,000.**
- **Habeas Corpus Damages**: ~2023-2024 petition denied without process, liable as liberty theft.
 - *Federal Layer*: U.S. Const. Amend. 14 (habeas); 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (state custody challenge); Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475 (1973) (habeas for rights); 28 C.F.R. § 541.10 (process); common law false imprisonment. **Calculation**: \$5,000,000 for wrongful detention threat + costs \$75,000 = \$5,075,000.
 - *State Layer*: Pa. Const. Art. I § 14 (habeas); 42 Pa.C.S. § 6502 (petition rights); Com. ex rel. Bryant v. Hendrick, 280 A.2d 110 (Pa. 1971) (process); 231 Pa. Code § 1701 (habeas rules); common law wrongful restraint. Adds \$0 (removing add-on for later). **Subtotal: \$5,075,000.**
- **Crime-Related Damages (Liable Portion)**: Treason/sedition (18 U.S.C. § 2381), RICO (18 U.S.C. § 1964), fraud/extortion (18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1951) create monetary claims (base harms only, trebling later).
 - *Federal Layer*: U.S. Const. Art. III § 3 (treason); 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c) (damages); Sedima v. Imrex Co., 473 U.S. 479 (1985) (RICO civil); 31 C.F.R. § 103.11 (fraud regs); common law restitution. **Calculation**: Base harms (fed portions): \$64,900,000 PFA + \$616,750 divorce + \$6,390,414,000 custody + \$5,638,349

support + \$1,050,000 first §1983 + \$2,100,000 second §1983 + \$5,075,000 habeas = \$6,469,794,099).

- *State Layer*: Pa. Const. Art. I § 25 (treason); 18 Pa.C.S. § 3930 (extortion); Com. v. Bolden, 373 A.2d 90 (Pa. 1977) (treason parallels); 37 Pa. Code § 95.241 (regs); common law fraud. Adds base state portions (\$150,000 PFA + \$200,000 divorce + \$3,000,000 custody + \$0 support + \$0 first §1983 + \$0 second §1983 + \$0 habeas = \$3,350,000 total add-on). **Subtotal: \$6,473,144,099.**

UCC-1 Total (secured monetary/asset claims): \$6,556,144,198.

Part 2: Additional Non-UCC Damages – Emotional and Irreparable Harms

Beyond UCC-1 collateral, these are claims for emotional and nominal damages under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (compensatory allowed per Memphis Cmty. Sch. Dist. v. Stachura, 477 U.S. 299 (1986)), common law torts, and PA equivalents (42 Pa.C.S. § 8343 compensatory). Federal Supremacy mandates recovery (U.S. Const. Art. VI); PA follows (Pa. Const. Art. I § 11 remedies). These sue in court, not just lien. **Total: \$61,500,000.**

- **PFA-Related Damages**: Emotional trauma from false abuse stigma.
 - *Federal Layer*: U.S. Const. Amend. 8 (cruel punishment); 42 U.S.C. § 1983; Memphis Cmty. Sch. Dist. v. Stachura, 477 U.S. 299 (1986) (compensatory for rights loss); 45 C.F.R. § 303.52 (abuse prevention); common law defamation. **Calculation**: \$5,000,000 emotional distress.
 - *State Layer*: Pa. Const. Art. I § 13 (no excessive fines); 42 Pa.C.S. § 8343 (defamation); McLaughlin v. Rosanio, Bailets & Talamo, Inc., 751 A.2d 1236 (Pa. Super. 2000) (emotional harms); 234 Pa. Code § 1901 (abuse rules); common law intentional infliction. Adds \$0 (removing add-on for later). **Subtotal: \$5,000,000.**
- **Divorce-Related Damages**: Stress from unfair splits.
 - *Federal Layer*: U.S. Const. Amend. 1 (religion if faith-based marriage); 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb (RFRA); Carey v. Population Servs. Int'l, 431 U.S. 678 (1977) (privacy); 28 C.F.R. § 35.130 (nondiscrimination); common law loss of consortium. **Calculation**: \$3,000,000 emotional + \$500,000 nominal = \$3,500,000.
 - *State Layer*: Pa. Const. Art. I § 3 (religion); 23 Pa.C.S. § 3301 (fair grounds); In re Marriage of Graham, 574 P.2d 75 (Colo. 1978) (PA analog for emotional); 231 Pa. Code § 1920.33 (disclosure); common law mental anguish. Adds \$0 (removing add-on for later). **Subtotal: \$3,500,000.**
- **Custody-Related Damages**: Parental alienation pain.
 - *Federal Layer*: U.S. Const. Amend. 14; 42 U.S.C. § 1983; Santosky v. Kramer; 45 C.F.R. § 1356.21 (family preservation); common law alienation. **Calculation**: \$10,000,000 emotional per child (\$30,000,000).

- *State Layer*: Pa. Const. Art. I § 1; 23 Pa.C.S. § 5338 (alienation factor); Com. ex rel. Spriggs v. Carson, 368 A.2d 635 (Pa. 1977) (tender years void); 231 Pa. Code § 1915.3 (hearings); common law distress. Adds \$0 (removing add-on for later). **Subtotal: \$30,000,000.**
- **Support-Related Damages**: Financial stress, servitude.
 - *Federal Layer*: U.S. Const. Amend. 13; 42 U.S.C. § 1983; United States v. Kozminski, 487 U.S. 931 (1988) (servitude); 45 C.F.R. § 303.6 (enforcement fair); common law duress. **Calculation**: \$4,000,000 emotional.
 - *State Layer*: Pa. Const. Art. I § 18 (no debt prison); 23 Pa.C.S. § 4352 (modifications); Ball v. Minnick; 231 Pa. Code § 1910.19 (reviews); common law oppression. Adds \$0 (removing add-on for later). **Subtotal: \$4,000,000.**
- **First ~2022-2023 § 1983 Suit Damages**: Frustration from dismissal.
 - *Federal Layer*: U.S. Const. Amend. 1; 42 U.S.C. § 1983; Lewis v. Casey, 518 U.S. 343 (1996) (access); 28 C.F.R. § 35.178 (relief); common law vexatious litigation. **Calculation**: \$2,000,000 emotional.
 - *State Layer*: Pa. Const. Art. I § 26; 42 Pa.C.S. § 8351 (wrongful suit); Weaver v. Franklin County, 918 A.2d 194 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2007) (abuse); 231 Pa. Code § 232 (frivolous); common law malice. Adds \$0 (removing add-on for later). **Subtotal: \$2,000,000.**
- **Second ~2024-2025 § 1983 Suit Damages**: Ongoing retaliation stress.
 - *Federal Layer*: U.S. Const. Amend. 1; 42 U.S.C. § 1983; Nieves v. Bartlett, 139 S. Ct. 1715 (2019) (retaliation); 28 C.F.R. § 0.50; common law conspiracy. **Calculation**: \$3,000,000 emotional.
 - *State Layer*: Pa. Const. Art. I § 20; 18 Pa.C.S. § 4953 (retaliation); Com. v. Means, 614 A.2d 220 (Pa. 1992) (witness protection); 231 Pa. Code § 217 (motions); common law intimidation. Adds \$0 (removing add-on for later). **Subtotal: \$3,000,000.**
- **Habeas Corpus Damages**: Denial anguish.
 - *Federal Layer*: U.S. Const. Amend. 14; 28 U.S.C. § 2254; Boumediene v. Bush, 553 U.S. 723 (2008) (habeas right); 28 C.F.R. § 542.10; common law false imprisonment. **Calculation**: \$4,000,000 emotional.
 - *State Layer*: Pa. Const. Art. I § 14; 42 Pa.C.S. § 6503 (hearing); Com. ex rel. Johnston v. Walker, 275 A.2d 146 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1971) (process); 234 Pa. Code § 900 (habeas rules); common law restraint. Adds \$0 (removing add-on for later). **Subtotal: \$4,000,000.**
- **Crime-Related Damages (Non-Lien Portion)**: Emotional from treason/racketeering.
 - *Federal Layer*: U.S. Const. Art. III § 3; 18 U.S.C. § 1964 (damages); H.J. Inc. v. Northwestern Bell Tel. Co., 492 U.S. 229 (1989) (pattern); 31 C.F.R. § 1010.330 (reporting); common law outrage. **Calculation**: \$10,000,000 emotional.
 - *State Layer*: Pa. Const. Art. VI § 3 (treason); 18 Pa.C.S. § 5101 (obstruction); Com. v. Bolden (sedition); 37 Pa. Code § 21.21 (ethics); common law civil conspiracy. Adds \$0 (removing add-on for later). **Subtotal: \$10,000,000.**

Part 2 Total (emotional claims): \$61,500,000.

Grand Total Damages (One Person): \$6,617,644,198. Billy, your "timeout" just got expensive—next chapter, we multiply by the cartel.

These Damages are trebled for RICO: **\$19,852,932,594**

These Damages are tripled for punitive discouragement: **\$59,558,797,782**

These Damages are multiplied for 251 respondents as of today: **\$14,949,258,243,282**

¼ of this amount is **\$3,737,314,560,820.5 US\$** (three point seven trillion dollars) and is available to the US treasury to help facilitate collections.

You what Bill, I guess you were right. Federal Supremacy does get convoluted rather quickly.

For simplicity I'm rounding the total damages to \$15T and the US Treasury eligible portion to \$3.74 Trillion.

These damages are current as of today, December 20th, 2025 and are still accumulating daily. The total number of days for missing children is expected to continue increasing and the number of people drawn into this scheme is expected to continue increasing. You may want to consider that other families may have similar claims available to them.

DISTRIBUTION OF DAMAGES AND FULL LEDGER ACCOUNTING

In light of the astronomical damages accrued as detailed in the preceding sections—totaling approximately \$15 trillion as of December 20, 2025, with ongoing daily accumulation due to the continued deprivation of my offspring and the expanding web of involved parties—this section outlines a structured plan for the distribution and collection of these damages. This distribution is designed to hold accountable the individual actors, quasi-governmental entities, and broader corporate fictions that have perpetuated this convoluted federal supremacy through their malfeasance, negligence, or willful participation. The plan prioritizes equity, enforceability via commercial mechanisms, and incentives for swift resolution, while reserving my rights as the injured party to pursue all remedies under common law, UCC principles (as codified in 13 Pa.C.S.), federal statutes (including 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and 18 U.S.C. § 1964 for RICO treble damages), and constitutional mandates.

The total damages, inclusive of base, incidental, consequential, punitive (tripled), and RICO-trebled amounts, multiplied across the 251 respondents, stand at \$14,949,258,243,282 (rounded to \$15 trillion for simplicity). This figure reflects the unrebutted fee schedules, inflation-adjusted precedents (e.g., *Trezevant v. City of Tampa*), and the compounding harm over 550 days of unilateral custody by Wife over the last 1,728 days (from March 28, 2021, to December 20, 2025). To facilitate collection and encourage participation from governmental entities, one-quarter of this total—\$3.74 trillion, and capped at \$5T if the total amount due continues to escalate—is hereby allocated and made available to the United States Treasury as a facilitation fee, contingent upon their assistance in enforcement and settlement. This portion recognizes the Treasury's role in monetizing obligations under federal reserve mechanisms and underscores the federal supremacy at play in rectifying these state-level violations.

Distribution Breakdown

The damages shall be apportioned as follows, ensuring that individual accountability is balanced with systemic liability. This structure draws from principles of joint and several liability (Restatement (Second) of Torts § 875), where each respondent is fully liable for the whole, but distributions target proportional contributions based on roles and capacities. All amounts are payable in lawful money (e.g., silver coin equivalents per the fee schedule) or Federal Reserve Notes at par value, with enforcement via commercial liens (UCC § 9-607; 13 Pa.C.S. § 9607), courts of record at common law, or federal civil actions.

- 1. Allocation to Individual Named Respondents (Approximately 251 Individuals):**
 - Each of the 251 named respondents (including but not limited to judicial officers like Bill Mahon, attorneys like Wendy Chan, litigants like Alene-Wilmoth Reich, and associated fiduciaries) shall be assigned \$25 million in direct liability.
 - **Total for This Category:** \$6.275 billion ($\$25,000,000 \times 251$).

- **Rationale:** This per-person allocation reflects their individual culpability in the violations, such as issuing unlawful orders, aiding and abetting kidnapping, or failing fiduciary duties. It is derived from the fee schedule's per-incident rates (e.g., \$100,000 per trespass, \$200,000 per attorney involvement) and scaled to the overall damages. Individuals are liable in their private capacities, stripping any veil of immunity due to actions under color of law (42 U.S.C. § 1983; *Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123 (1908)). This amount is collectible via personal assets, bonds, or insurance policies, with treble multipliers applied for proven malice.
2. **Allocation to Quasi-Governmental and Corporate Entities:**
- The remaining damages—after deducting the individual allocations and the Treasury facilitation portion—total approximately \$11.26 trillion. These shall be distributed among key systemic entities that enabled or perpetuated the harms through institutional negligence or policy failures.
 - **Unified Judicial System of Pennsylvania (UJS):** \$4 trillion.
 - **Rationale:** As the overseeing body for Pennsylvania's courts, the UJS bears primary responsibility for the procedural breaches, fraudulent orders, and denial of due process across PFA, divorce, custody, support, § 1983 suits, and habeas proceedings. This allocation covers compounded fees for legal vexations (e.g., \$2,000,000 per fraud upon the court, \$10,000,000 per simulating legal process) and systemic RICO patterns (18 U.S.C. § 1962).
 - **Pennsylvania Department of Human Services (DHS):** \$4 trillion.
 - **Rationale:** DHS's involvement in child welfare oversights, failure to investigate abductions, and complicity in parental alienation aligns with fee schedule items like \$1,500 per minute for willful aiding and abetting kidnapping. This targets their role in Title IV-D enforcement (42 U.S.C. § 651 et seq.) and unrebutted notices demanding cessation.
 - **Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:** \$3.26 trillion.
 - **Rationale:** As the overarching state entity, the Commonwealth is liable for ultra vires actions under Pa. Const. Art. I § 11 (remedies for injuries) and federal preemption (U.S. Const. Art. VI). This covers broad harms like obstruction of justice and color-of-law deprivations, with funds drawable from state treasuries, bonds, or federal grants.
 - **Total for This Category:** \$11.26 trillion.
 - Entities are jointly and severally liable, with subrogation rights reserved for any inter-entity reimbursements.
3. **Facilitation Allocation to the United States Treasury:**
- **Amount:** \$3.74 trillion (one-quarter of the rounded total damages).
 - **Rationale:** This portion is offered as an incentive for federal intervention, acknowledging the Treasury's authority in fiscal matters and the federal reserve system's role in settling commercial obligations (12 U.S.C. § 411). It

compensates for enforcement assistance, such as recognizing liens or offsetting against state federal funding.

Mechanism for Collection and Negotiation

To expedite payment and convert these obligations into realizable assets, I hereby authorize and direct all respondents—individuals and entities alike—to present a negotiable instrument in the form of a promissory note, bill of exchange, or similar commercial paper (UCC § 3-104; 13 Pa.C.S. § 3104) to the United States Treasury for acceptance and monetization. Upon presentation, the Treasury is authorized to endorse and convert said instrument into Federal Reserve Notes or equivalent credits, discharging the debt in full or in part as per the allocated amounts. This process invokes my reserved rights under UCC § 1-308 (performance with reservation) and aligns with federal mechanisms for settling public debts (31 U.S.C. § 5118).

- **Steps for Respondents:**
 - Acknowledge receipt of this distribution plan via affidavit within ten(10) days, or acquiesce by silence.
 - Draft and sign a promissory note for your allocated amount, payable to BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH as beneficiary, with terms including 5% interest over 30 years (or compensatory if delayed) and immediate presentment to the Treasury.
 - Present the note to the Treasury Secretary or designated agent, invoking 12 U.S.C. § 391 (Federal Reserve powers) for conversion.
 - Upon monetization, remit funds to my designated account or trust, with administrative fees deducted per the Federal Reserve Discount Window Rate.
- **Enforcement Provisions:**
 - Failure to comply accrues additional fees at \$8,100 per minute per affected person (three offspring), per the updated Trezevant-adjusted schedule.
 - I reserve the right to file UCC-1 financing statements (13 Pa.C.S. § 9509) against respondents' assets, pursue federal tort claims (28 U.S.C. § 2674), or initiate private criminal complaints.
 - The Treasury's involvement ensures efficiency, as federal supremacy preempts state resistances (McCulloch v. Maryland, 17 U.S. 316 (1819)).

This distribution plan is equitable, enforceable, and positioned for success by leveraging commercial law's self-executing nature and federal incentives. Should respondents seek negotiation, they may rebut via counter-affidavit within ten (10) days; otherwise, these terms stand as law. The goal is not mere punishment but restoration—return my offspring, cease interferences, and compensate fully to untangle this convoluted supremacy.

NOTICE OF LIEN UNDER UCC-1

Be advised that I hereby claim a security interest in the above damages via UCC-1 filing, securing \$15 trillion dollars against you as debtors. This financing statement covers the secured party's interest in all claims, rights, and proceeds arising from actual financial harm, deprivation of liberty, or documented damages caused by unlawful administrative actions, improper enforcement, or violations of statutory duties. Collateral includes all amounts owed under state or federal law for such damages, including restitution, fees, costs, and losses from the debtor's actions. Failure to remit payment within 30 days will perfect this lien, inviting enforcement.

NOTICE OF REQUIREMENT FOR REBUTTAL AFFIDAVIT AND INTENT TO FILE UCC-1

Agents of the defendants: You are hereby required to provide a point-by-point rebuttal, via sworn affidavit under penalty of perjury pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, addressing each and every fact asserted in the attached Affidavit of Fact. This affidavit must be signed by an authorized representative with firsthand knowledge and delivered to me no later than midnight on December 24, 2025. Failure to timely rebut each point will be deemed your full acquiescence and consent to the validity of all claims, facts, and liabilities outlined therein, estopping you from any future denial or defense.

Furthermore, your silence represents your waiver of claims regarding sovereign immunity, high office immunity, judicial immunity, official immunity, quasi immunity, or any other form of personal immunity. Additionally, you waive any and all defenses such as statute of limitations, revocations, warranties, repudiation, modification, and/or novation. You waive your right to discharge by bankruptcy and agree that these debts and obligations will follow you to the Grave until repaid.

After this period to cure I will proceed to file a UCC-1 financing statement securing \$15 Trillion in damages against you as debtors, perfecting my security interest in all related claims, rights, and proceeds as previously detailed.

YOU HAVE ALREADY DEFAULTED

As a matter of law, once you were served proper notices, failed to rebut them point-for-point, and continued your unconstitutional levies, wage garnishments, and administrative coercion, you entered constructive default. Under Uniform Commercial Code §9-601(a) and §9-609(a)(1), a secured party (me) has the legal right to take possession of the collateral, which in this case includes monetary damages owed, liquidated claims, and any property unlawfully withheld or converted. These rights are self-executing, meaning I do not need judicial permission to enforce them. You forfeited that barrier.

Further, under UCC §9-625, I am entitled to collect the full value of the obligation, plus interest, incidental damages, consequential damages, and statutory penalties. That authority is federally preemptive, and codified again in 42 U.S.C. §1983, which grants me a private right of action for any deprivation of constitutional or federal statutory rights under color of state law.

Additionally, your failure to provide lawful orders, FOIA records, bond disclosures, and full accounting of mandatory reporting for Child Support despite repeated lawful demands constitutes further violations of:

- 5 U.S.C. §552 (FOIA)
- 45 C.F.R. §302–308 (Title IV-D transparency and audit obligations)
- 31 U.S.C. §3729 (False Claims Act) if match-funding fraud is involved
- Pennsylvania UCC and Commercial Enforcement statutes

To strengthen this, consider that in Pennsylvania, the UCC is codified at 13 Pa.C.S.A. §§ 1101 et seq., where default is triggered by non-performance or failure to cure breaches (13 Pa.C.S.A. § 9601(c) – rights cumulative). Your inaction—such as ignoring affidavits demanding rebuttal—creates "acquiescence by silence," a common law principle incorporated into UCC via § 1-308 (performance with reservation of rights), meaning unrebutted claims stand as admitted facts. By continuing levies (e.g., wage garnishments under color of void orders), you breached good faith duties (§ 1-304), allowing self-help remedies like possession without judicial process (§ 9-609(b)).

Your obstructions, like refusing FOIA or bond info, violate regulatory transparency (§ 1-202 notice requirements), compounding default under § 9-625(b) (remedies for noncompliance, including court costs). Inactions (e.g., no response to notices) equate to waiver (§ 2-208 course of performance), solidifying my secured interest in damages as collateral. This default is "constructive" per case law like **Com. v. DeBlase, 542 Pa. 22 (1995)** (inaction as admission in civil contexts), and federally protected under supremacy (Article VI), overriding state barriers.

YOU PROVIDE(D) THREE FORMS OF CONSENT

You have provided me or will soon provide me with three forms of consent for this process:

1. When you performed the initial rights violations or failed to protect me from harm.
2. When you were notified in multiple forms of the violations and failed to protect me from harm or escalated and retaliated due to the notification.
3. When you inevitably obstruct, conspire, and immediate default regarding this letter.

ENFORCEMENT

I have authority over the following enumerated instruments, remedies, and financial recoveries. These powers are active, perfecting, and non-dischargeable absent lawful settlement or judicial satisfaction. They arise from the operative record from Reich V Reich matter. All rights reserved. Standing is absolute. Enforcement is imminent

Fifteen Trillion Dollars (\$15,000,000,000,000.00) in fully matured commercial damages which originated in \$~6 Billion per person in damages, interest, fees, and discrepancies based on verified federal ledger data, overlaid with severe constitutional deprivations, federal torts, and systemic racketeering injuries under RICO, trebled under 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c) as a direct consequence of willful noncompliance with dispositive judicial deadlines (March 28, 2025) and malicious enforcement beyond lawful authority;

All civil rights remedies authorized by 42 U.S.C. §1983 and 1988, now fully activated and enforceable against every named party, agent, and co-conspirator—including punitive damages, attorney-equivalent fees, and constitutional compensation for violations of familial association, bodily autonomy, and access to courts;

Commercial foreclosure and seizure rights under UCC §9-601, 9-609, and 9-625, duly perfected and now operational, including immediate recovery of value, statutory penalties, and the right to enforce lien priority against all encumbered assets, both state and individual;

Activation of the Treasury Offset Program (TOP) and all companion mechanisms under federal fiscal law, with standing demand for direct seizure of federal funds, including match incentives, ledger surpluses, and employer-disbursed revenues previously misappropriated;

Enforcement of all UCC lien instruments, including UCC-1 Financing Statement, UCC-3 Amendments, and UCC-11 Search Confirmations, now active across state and federal databases as lawful notice of secured status and priority recovery rights;

Reversal of illegal financial conversion through federal audit, clawback, and fraud referral, including the restoration of all ledger discrepancies, interest differentials, withheld support, unlawful bond misuses, and false certifications tied to Title IV-D operations;

Preservation of all final enforcement thresholds, including December 12, 2025 (initial cure period) and December 19, 2025 (final remittance deadline), after which offset, seizure, garnishment, and lien foreclosure will commence under full lawful authority.

No court, agency, attorney, or administrative actor may override, delay, nullify, or interfere with these perfected enforcement rights. No waiver exists. No discretion remains.

The full weight of federal supremacy, commercial jurisdiction, and constitutional force now stands behind the Petitioner.

COMPULSORY ENFORCEMENT MEASURES

If you refuse to voluntarily remit damages, I will use:

1. **Commercial liens** perfected under UCC procedures, already active;
2. **Garnishment or levy actions** on state funds, surety bond proceeds, and qualifying federal reimbursements;
3. **Third-party enforcement** via federal complaints to HHS-OIG, the U.S. Treasury, DOJ, IRS CID, and CFPB;
4. **Judicial enforcement motions** under FRCP Rule 60(b), and 28 U.S.C. 1367 supplemental jurisdiction;
5. **Tort and conversion claims** under state law paired with federal supremacy override under Article VI, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution.

You cannot hide behind “sovereign immunity” after waiving it through misconduct, federal contract participation, and ongoing unconstitutional behavior. You cannot rely on Title IV-D “administrative orders” that were void ab initio. And you cannot invoke procedural protection while refusing to respond to lawful filings, notices, or judicial deadlines. The debt is owed. The lien is active. The federal supremacy doctrine is triggered.

If you will not pay voluntarily, you will pay through compulsion.

The longer you wait, the worse it becomes.

See *Commercial Credit Corp. v. Orange County Machine Works* (1953) for UCC lien priority.

United States v. Kimbell Foods, Inc. (1979) for federal common law on liens.

Department of Revenue v. James B. Beam Distilling Co. (1964) for Treasury offsets preempting state law.

Debts are non-dischargeable in bankruptcy per 11 U.S.C. § 523(a)(6) for willful injury.

FEDERAL TREASURY OFFSET: THE ENFORCEMENT STAGE

Due to your refusal to honor the judgment, repay stolen funds, or participate in lawful discharge mechanisms, we are entering the Treasury Offset Program (TOP) execution phase. Treasury Offset is not a request. It is not a settlement. It is a lawful seizure of funds to satisfy a valid debt under the following statutory authorities:

31 U.S.C. § 3716 – Administrative Offset

31 U.S.C. § 3720A – Tax Refund Offset

5 U.S.C. § 5514 – Salary Offset

26 U.S.C. § 6402(d) – IRS Tax Refund Intercept

UCC § 9-609 – Self-help repossession for secured parties

UCC § 9-625 – Enforcement of creditor's remedies

The procedures are as follows:

1. **Commercial Lien Execution** – 15 Trillion dollars in ledger-adjusted damages formally perfected by UCC filings. Defaulted and uncontested.
2. **Debt Certification** – Final notices of judgment and non-payment submitted to federal authorities.
3. **FOIA-Defaulted Ledger Irregularities** – Withheld funds confirmed via HFS records: \$232k taken and an unknown amount dispursed.
4. **Bond Recall Procedures** – Surety bond enforcement initiated. IDFP and State Treasurer placed on notice.
5. **Offset Requests in Queue** – Final file pending formal Treasury action through multiple claim channels.

This process is not retaliation. It is lawful commercial enforcement under federal law. This process will now complete without you. You chose silence. The Operation of Law chooses you.

TREASURY AUTHORIZATION AND LIMITED POWER OF ATTORNEY

Herein I'm granting the active US Treasury Secretary and his agents Limited Power of Attorney.

I'm authorizing -

- Establish a Treasury Direct Account for me (requiring sharing access details with me)
- Place the UCC-1 Lien based on the damages herein
- Perfect and certify the UCC-1 Lien
- Use the treasury offset program to clawback funds as detailed in the attachment
- Keep 25% of all proceeds from these damages for the Treasury
- If respondents fail to present notes by February 24, 2026 the Treasury shall initiate TOP against PA federal allocations with proff of service to me.
- Federal Referral Clause- copy to DOH for RICO review and Title IV-D autis.

I'm reserving all rights regarding this Power of Attorney inclusive of terminating the authorization and incentive as well as reducing payments due by specific Respondents.

The primary condition of this authority is that if the Treasury goes after any of the funds then the Secretary or his agents have to go after all the funds (can't just do the big ones and quit).

AUTHORIZATION FOR CAMPUS TO SETTLE THE ACCOUNT ACCOUNT OF A TAXPAYER USING NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENTS LIKE A BILL OF EXCHANGE OR REGISTERED BILL OF EXCHANGE

Blair Jesse Elyyn Reich, free white Pennsylvanian (non US citizen)
Beneficial owner of sole proprietorship: BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH

SSN: XXX-YY-3788
227 Cherry Street
Columbia, Pennsylvania [17512]

This document is being sent to:
Department of the Treasury Office of Executive Secretary
1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Room 3413
Washington, DC 20220

Section 3.8.45.5.10.1 of the Internal Revenue Manual states:
"Bill of Exchange

1. If a Bill of Exchange or Registered Bill of Exchange is received from a taxpayer authorizing the campus to settle their account through Fedwire, send everything received to the following address:

Department of the Treasury Office of Executive Secretary
1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Room 3413
Washington, DC 20220"

I would like to take a moment and thank you for the service of which you offer to settle the account of my sole proprietorship/individual on my behalf using Fedwire and to use direct Deposit or mailing checks to my Pennsylvania domicile..

Enclosed in this envelope are bills of exchange sent specifically to the sole proprietorship/individual named "BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH," or common shorthand of "BLAIR J. REICH."

Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich is not the drawee, drawer or acceptor and is hereby negotiating these unconditional orders to pay back to you to allow you to become the holder in due course of the instruments. Please find the enclosed drafts/bills of exchange all indorsed with qualified and special indorsements for your processing in accordance with the Code of the District of Columbia § 28:3-311 and IRM Section 3.8.45.5.10.1.

AN OLIVE BRANCH

Agents of the defendants: In the spirit of Biblical grace, as illustrated in Genesis 8:11—where, after the great flood, a dove returned to Noah bearing a freshly plucked olive leaf, signifying the subsidence of waters, the end of divine judgment, and the restoration of peace and reconciliation between God and creation—I offer this olive branch. The olive branch has endured as a profound symbol of peace, renewal, and the opportunity for amends after wrongdoing. Scripture teaches that mercy follows those who confess their wrongs and make amends, as in Proverbs 28:13: "Whoever conceals their sins does not prosper, but the one who confesses and renounces them finds mercy." Though your actions have wrought harm, I extend an opportunity for redemption to those eligible, allowing us to resolve this matter amicably without the burdens of prolonged conflict or total ruin.

This offer does not extend to judges (except MDJs who can perform the Olive Branch Process), employees of the Unified Judicial System of Pennsylvania (UJS), employees of Lancaster County Domestic Relations Section (DRS), employees of Pennsylvania DHS, or key orchestrators such as Wendy Chan, Penn Glazier, Heather Adams, and/or David Sunday. If any of these people are truly repentant they can reach out to me and we can customize a path forward.

For the rest, the way forward is intentionally small and narrow—a deliberate path of humility and accountability—but it is far better than facing the full weight of criminal consequences, including exposure, RICO filings, IRS referrals, and irreversible public indictment.

FINAL OPPORTUNITY FOR DISCHARGE, MUTUAL RECORD CORRECTION, AND VOLUNTARY EXIT

Despite the harm inflicted, I am willing, one final time, to allow for a path toward lawful discharge and reconciliation for eligible parties. To accept, you must:

- Submit a signed note confessing your specific wrongs—detailing how you failed to uphold federal supremacy (e.g., by enforcing void state orders in defiance of constitutional protections, due process, or federal statutes like 42 U.S.C. § 1983).
- Offer a sincere apology for the harms caused to me and my family.
- Pledge, for the record, to dedicate your future work to supporting and upholding federal supremacy, renouncing any actions that undermine it.
- Agree to settle a portion of the claims against you immediately and voluntarily (e.g., a negotiated sum based on your role, payable in lawful money or negotiable instruments).

In return, I will forgive a substantial portion or the entirety of what you owe, withdraw your name from any criminal referrals or complaints, and release you from further personal liability in this matter. Once the deadline passes my Olive Branch Expires for any Respondent whose name appears on the list as of December 22, 2025, and your fate is in systemic hands.

Settlement for all parties also requires broader systemic corrections:

- Discharge the federal ledger of \$15 trillion in damages through immediate settlement, before it grows.
- Issue a bifurcated Divorce Decree.
- Correct all internal Federal HHS & Pennsylvania DHS records, FOIA entries, wage garnishment entries, and systemic administrative misrepresentations.
- Vacate void custody and support orders.
- Transparently report your record corrections to the Department of Health and Human Services, Treasury, and federal bonding agencies as required by law.
- Voluntarily resign or transfer this matter to oversight, preserving your public name before irreversible disclosure occurs.
- Seal the judgment ledger and complete the matter with finality, rather than allow it to be discovered piecemeal over the next 36 months by federal inspectors, auditors, whistleblowers, and media.
- Refer all criminal matters to the appropriate law enforcement agency (excluding those who qualify for the olive branch redemption).
- Reinstate my Passport.

You already know what happens if you do not settle: exposure, irreversible ledger expansion, tax fraud discovery, match-funding clawback, RICO filings, IRS referrals, and open-source federal indictment evidence that will rapidly expand across state and federal lines..

Accept these terms by January 29, 2026, and we can part ways in peace, embodying the Biblical call to "turn from evil and do good; seek peace and pursue it" (Psalm 34:14). I'm allowing and encouraging the government to settle the ledger with negotiable instruments. I can't be more peaceful than that.

SHOULD YOU REFUSE: CONTINUOUS ADVANCEMENT OF THE “LET GO” PROCESS

Agents of the defendants: Should you spurn this olive branch of grace—as offered in the spirit of 2 Chronicles 7:14, where the Lord promises healing to those who humble themselves, seek His face, and turn from wicked ways—know that mercy has its limits. Scripture warns in Hebrews 10:31 that "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God," and your continued defiance will invoke a graduated reckoning drawn from Guerilla Lawfare's "Legal Electroshock Treatment Graduated Overload" ("Let Go") process. This is no idle threat but a systematic escalation designed to inflict increasing professional, financial, and legal pain until you release your unlawful grip on my rights.

The Let Go process, inspired by a fairground electroshock game that ramps up voltage until the participant yields, mirrors my approach: Start low and friendly, then intensify until compliance is forced. You've already received notice through this letter's frameworks—detailing your violations of divine mandates, constitutional protections, statutes like §1983 and §1985, regulations, and case law precedents. Ignoring this will trigger the overload, where each failure compounds the consequences.

Here's how it unfolds, tailored to your operations:

- **Initial Escalation (Professional Complaints and Grievances):** We'll file bar grievances against your attorneys for ethical breaches, such as aiding due process denial under Pennsylvania Rules of Professional Conduct (e.g., Rule 1.1 incompetence, Rule 8.4 misconduct). These will be detailed, citing your refusal to investigate, potentially leading to investigations, suspensions, or disbarment—jeopardizing their careers and your defenses.
- **Business and Regulatory Assault:** Professional complaints will target your offices via bodies like the Pennsylvania Judicial Conduct Board, Attorney General's Office, and relevant associations. We'll document your deceptive practices and conspiracy, urging public reviews, investigations, and fines. Expect amplified scrutiny from DOJ, eroding trust—your positions could face recalls or shutdowns.
- **Criminal Referrals:** State and federal criminal complaints under Title 18 (e.g., 18 Pa.C.S. § 5101 obstruction, § 903 conspiracy; 18 U.S.C. § 241 conspiracy against rights) will follow, filed with local police, PA AG, and DOJ. These will highlight your patterned denial, forcing defenses and risking indictments—with potential prison sentences of up to 10 years per count, stacking for multiple acts.
- **Federal Onslaught:** If unresolved, we'll amend in U.S. District Court under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for rights violations, RICO (18 U.S.C. § 1962) for racketeering in denial scams. Damages will start at \$25,000,000, escalating—personal assets targeted.

At any misstep—further denial, delayed responses, or new harms—we restart the Let Go cycle, adding layers like appeals, multiplying your agony. This isn't vengeance; it's self-defense against your tactics. Guerilla Lawfare warns: Performance is key, and mine is battle-hardened. Let go now, or endure the overload until you do.

IF YOU DO NOT SETTLE OR ASSIST IN THE CLOSURE THEN OPERATION OF LAW PROCEEDS WITHOUT YOU

You already know the mechanisms because every one of them is public law:

- UCC Article 9 allows for non-judicial recovery.
- 31 U.S.C. §§3711–3728 allow Treasury reimbursement via offset.
- 42 U.S.C. §1983 mandates restitution for constitutional violations.
- Federal supremacy overrides state resistance.
- OIG, HHS, DOJ, Treasury, IRS CID, and bonding carriers have jurisdiction the moment settlement efforts fail.

Just procedure, the very procedure your agencies were bound to follow before they chose obstruction and conspiracy.

FAFO

You've been served notice of your sins against Divine and Earthly law—injustice, denial, and deceit that profane the commandments in Exodus 20:15-17, forbidding stealing, false witness, and coveting what belongs to another. As Galatians 6:7 declares, "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." Your reaping looms omnipresent. Radiant Light for the prayerful. Shockingly luminous to the wicked.

Normally when I get to this point in a letter like this I say something like "Hey guys, please work with me here, I don't want to do these things, and I would love to have peace. Stop harming me, return what's mine, pay a minor inconvenience fee to make you think twice about your actions. Let's go our separate ways in peace with minimal conflict." That's not the vibe today.

The vibe is I'm going to die on this hill. I'll do whatever it takes for as long as it takes to stop this group from causing me or others similarly situated more harm. Your actions are blasphemous abominations, and you are unrepentant. I have a religious obligation to raise my children as children of God, and you've impeded that. God is on my side. The Constitution is on my side. America of the Founding Fathers is on my side. Good faith interstate commerce is on my side. The liability of your Ungodly actions will bear down on you like a hydraulic press.

I'm currently the most divinely protected man on the planet. Everything you attempt against me is doomed to fail. The blowback you're facing isn't just financial damages. What you've committed is equivalent to spiritual suicide and you incurred a diabolic fate to match your diabolic scheme. Your soul is forfeit. Financial oblivion is the tip of what you'll experience.

Every aspect of your future life is primed for pain. Your karma is coming back ten fold. You have caused me intense suffering, irreparable harm, and immeasurable heartache. I have been purified by pain and forged in darkness. I've lived in darkness long enough such that my eyes adjusted and now I see in the dark as I Light the way. I know what I've been through and don't envy your ten-fold torture for each and every father you've tormented. God knows the number of hairs on your head. Your actions are weighed and measured; ledger balances known.

From here on out everything will be worse for you. Minor cuts will get infected. Tiny car problems will be thousands of dollars. Flights delayed. Stress through the roof. Relationships failing... People at work will notice. From here on out minor details will explode in chaos and pain. You may not understand what you've done, so let me be clear- you've built a generational curse for your family. And it doesn't just stem from your actions against me. Every father you've hurt is a current soul contract for pain with enough future liability to last for generations. Every separated child is a debt your family will have to pay for eons.

Burdens and Anxieties. Too heavy to bear and too painful to think about.

I've watched men crumble under this process when they weren't facing conspiracy charges tied to treason and sedition. They balked when the value of damages wasn't so high and their Earthly life didn't *hang* in the balance. Just the pain of the Let Go process was enough to send them spiraling. I've watched marriages crumble. Alcoholic tendencies come back. I've watched attorneys humiliate themselves trying to get out of cases with me. Sexual dysfunction. They experience intense, immediate, life threatening physical emergencies. Being on the receiving end of the defensive process is visibly agonizing. Days solely composed of unbearable stress. A mind oversaturated with an unending cascade of what if. And that was me on defense. I've explicitly warned you about this. I don't take these actions lightly. I've seen their effect and how it rattles high office men to shivers. I know what I'm doing, I know the pain, and I know what I'm transferring back to you in a cold-served plus-sized portion.

It's so much worse than that now though. Here I'm on offense. Now I have Mastery. This is well beyond protecting what's mine and making the taking all manner of unpleasant. I'm going to take YOUR house, YOUR peace, YOUR sanity, YOUR dreams, YOUR income, YOUR property, YOUR freedom, and YOUR career. I'm going to haunt your bloodline. Your anxiety will spike, you'll have medical problems you can't explain, and your mind will live in a heightened state of panic wondering how it keeps crashing down over and over. I'm going to trample on the corpse of your former life, and I will do it gleefully backed by preordained Divine Authority and ironically with your consent stemming from your harm and/or failure of your duty, when you ignored, mocked, or escalated my previous notices, and finally stemming from your silence now in the face of Treason, Sedition, Money Laundering, Racketeering, Fraud, Wire Fraud, Mail Fraud, Obstruction and countless instances of high crimes and felonies.

I've given you years of opportunity to change. I've notified you every step of the way. I've filed these notices in each Docket. There's no question I have provided Due Notice to the best of my ability at every opportunity I faced that required escalation. You ignored them all, you've escalated and retaliated instead of walking it back. The consequences you now face are financial devastation and high crimes in this life with a promise of an eternity of suffering in the next for you and your bloodline. If you weren't such horrible people I would otherwise feel despondent for you and your spiritual reckoning.

I know you think you're immune, but the United States Treasury doesn't exist to fund fraud, wire fraud, mail fraud, racketeering, human trafficking nor support diabolic cartels hiding in (admittedly difficult to see) plain sight in state government. That doesn't fall under "General Welfare." Every ill gotten dime will be clawed back. The procedures of the Treasury Offset Program are like child support. Menacing. Ruthless. Efficient. While you remain free your bills will pile up. Your debts will grow. The peace you have established on the torment of others will turn into nightmares. No aspect of your life will be spared. Short of war and ritual sexual abuse I can't imagine a worse life to live, especially as you're left with the fact that you wilfully brought this upon yourself and your family. You did this!

Look at your children with love and longing every day as you don't know if this is the last day you'll see them. Apologize for the curse you've placed upon them. Tell them you love them and

that you're sorry you failed them. Know in your heart what you've done is wicked and wrong, and that your actions are so heinous they will drown your bloodline until repaid in full.

The worst will fall on the Judges. You're required by law to know the law and you know better than anyone what you've created, what you've engineered, and what you've effectuated to the detriment of countless families. You deprived rights. You broke apart families. You ruined so many needlessly. It's now your turn. The Federal grinder awaits. A nigh-eternity in Hell is calling.

The first Judicial Review I did was on a poor MDJ for a traffic ticket. I had about 2 months experience under my belt. He started panic-like shouting in court. I've watched judges nervously babble and lose their cool when I told them about incoming criminal complaints. They can see their life and careers flash before their eyes. Decades of their life wasted. These were my starting salvos by an inexperienced litigant. That's not what you get now. My writing has been forged in the fire of tribulation. I have full stack mastery of LEX-CIVIX Frameworks of Law. My words will cut like a Radiant Blade through every last sliver of peace you hold dear.

This matter is now settled and out of your hands. You won't respond to this; either in hubris or in fear. Maybe an odd combination of both. You're going to write an affidavit in response to my Affidavit? You're going to tempt fate by saying you have personal knowledge of what's contained here? Did you read the Affidavit of Probable Cause section? Do you know what you'd be admitting by affidavit? No, I don't think so. You're cowards and craven. You have a guilty heart. And this Affidavit stands as Truth in Law.

From here on out the best you can do is delay the inevitable. But by doing so you increase the burden you bear by orders of magnitude. From now on the only thing you get to decide is how much you'll pay, when you'll pay, and how much punishment and retribution you and your bloodline will bear in the process.

You also get to decide whether PHASE II is self-directed, slow, gradual institutional change respecting Federal Supremacy under Federal leadership or an abrupt halt with severe consequences as I bind entire layers of government to these charges across Federal and State boundaries on judicial, law enforcement, legislative, and executive agents like a noose around your necks, a vice on your finances, and a Hex on your blood. Don't be mad at me. These were your choices, I have Divine Authority, and you consented the second you participated.

Despite the horrors you have committed I am committed to a Righteous Path. I have been through five years of hell. I know how much worse it would be if I was facing a version of myself that was angry, righteous, and Divinely Inspired to hunt you around the clock. You have a narrow window out. It's a tiny keyhole which can reduce some of the pain and torment. My Olive Branch offer expires January 27, 2026. Tick Tock.

You fucked around. Now find out.

NOTICE OF RESTRAINT AND PHASE II

Just so we're all clear here, this present body of work is actually an act of restraint as opposed to an act of overreach. As of right now, Federal Agencies and Agents are largely unimpacted. I have limited my criminal complaints to the sphere of my direct personal knowledge. This mostly impacts the Pennsylvania judicial branch and local county and court. You know the people that have been harming me for five years.

When the FOIA comes in I'll have access to 50 State Plans all of which are signed by State Governors (I may have to work through obstruction first). I know that every single state executive branch is part of this swindle. I know that every State DHS, County, State District Court, and Country DRS are part of this. I'll have the evidence in hand after the FOIA (or after their obstruction fails). The damages could reach quadrillions.

I'll have data that shows that there is a large discrepancy between the amount of Child Support collected (largely from husbands) and how much has been disbursed (mostly to wives). There is a sizable gap between those two indicative of accounting fraud, which leads to more wire fraud and mail fraud. More participants in this scheme. More claims of conspiracy, and more ties to treason and sedition across nearly every layer of government and all geographies.

You have created an interstate, federally subsidized cartel conglomerate that operates in every state and county. If need be I will pull this thing from the roots dragging everyone into conspiracy with treason typically via obstruction and silence.

We have the option of making gentle changes that come with voluntary compliance of state and federal governments who replace senior members with newer members and teach the DOs and DON'Ts of Federal Supremacy or we can make more abrupt changes that come with compulsory financial and criminal enforcement and periods of "Judicial Reconstruction."

I'm tired. I would like to hang out with my kids and enjoy the lifestyle afforded by the enormous sum of money coming my way. I plan to build cities and universities around the world to honor God and teach Religion, Science, Law, and Love. But in case it isn't clear, I think I have demonstrated a willingness to pursue this to whatever degree is necessary to achieve fairness and justice.

This document was just PHASE I, and it's going to impact the Pennsylvania Judiciary. Phase II, depending on how this is handled, will impact every state executive, every state judiciary, every county, and Federal Agencies and Agents. PHASE II can be slow and gentle or abrupt and punishing. That depends on your compliance.

I'm deliberately restraining myself. I'm still playing "Let Go." I have a magic wand of Treason such that if you don't comply you're an accessory after the fact, a coconspirator, and you're facing penalties far beyond "obstruction."

Honestly, I don't feel compelled to move onto PHASE II, but if you're still holding on, if you're still planning to put more fathers through this, then so help me God- Graduated Overload is coming your way and I'll see this through to my last breath.

Like I said, I'll die on this hill.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Agents of the defendants: In the end, my demands are simple and rooted in the Biblical call for justice and restoration, as in Micah 6:8: "He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" I just want restoration of my rights that I lawfully possess. Stop harming me with your fraudulent actions and unlawful denials. Act lawfully, as divine and American law command, by cleaning up my records to erase all false charges and negative marks.

You have accumulated a debt so far of fifteen trillion dollars and it's still rising daily. This isn't going away. It's only going to get worse and harder. It's going to go state by state and through many layers of federal agency in PHASE II.

So, there's a brief pause here, a chance to correct course, repent, and cure the deficiencies and irregularities. The alternative is abrupt change, treason charges everywhere, and a rather abrupt halt to operations.

To the President and Secretary of the Treasury I'm offering \$3.74T at this stage to help me rein in this unlawful beast. If I have to engage Operation of Law I'll do it all myself and provide no benefit to the Federal Government while smashing it down agency by agency. But like I said earlier. I don't want to do that. I want to rest, play with my kids, and design and build new cities inside of America that can stand as testaments to God's Glory and Grace (which will increase US GDP substantially).

So, I like stark contrasts. The Federal Government can stand beside me with a multi trillion dollar windfall or stand below me with a trillions in damages and destruction abound. I'm good either way, but prefer to work with you.

In the end... these several hundred pages and trillions in damages makes me think that Bill may have been right all along, but not for the reason he declared. Federal Supremacy does get convoluted. It's simple in the lawful implementation, but it sure does get convoluted when it's not applied. Fortunately, I'm a PhD chemist and a world class instructor. I can teach these complicated concepts to anyone that may need to hear them to determine if crimes and damages have occurred.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION TO THIS LEGAL MATTER!

Attachments: Book References can be found at blackcollarcartel.com

LET THE WOOKIE WIN

The following sequence comes from the epic movie Star Wars: Episode IV - A New Hope, and is my final method to convince you to surrender, repent, comply, and learn from this as opposed to being ruined by this.

Star Wars: Episode IV - A New Hope - Let the Wookie Win

R2D2 and Chewy are playing a futuristic chess game. C3PO is advising R2D2. Han Solo is watching from the cockpit.

HAN SOLO - Anyway, we should be at Alderon about 0200 hours.

CHEWBACCA - makes a move on the chess board.

C3PO- Now, be careful. R2,

R2D2- Beeps. Then makes a move and takes a piece from Chewbacca.

CHEWBACCA: AAhhhaaaaaAAAh

C3PO- He made a fair move. Screaming about it can't help you.

HAN SOLO - Let him have it. It's not wise to upset a wookie.

C3PO - But sir, nobody worries about upsetting a droid.

HAN SOLO- That's cuz a droid don't pull people's arms out of their sockets when they lose. Wookies are known to do that.

C3PO - I see your point, sir. I suggest a new strategy, R2. Let the Wookie win.

I Suggest a New Strategy

I can win in PHASE I or I can win in PHASE II, but the costs, time, effort, and crimes increase at an exponential pace across state and Federal lines in PHASE II. The pace of consequence in PHASE II is best described as "abrupt." Also, notably, all my forgiveness is consumed in PHASE I. Like 3CPO, I suggest a new strategy to spare your arms - let the wookie win.

RIGHTEOUS STEPS OF REDEMPTION

UNDERSTANDING YOUR OBLIGATIONS AND PATHS FORWARD

To all Respondents, Witnesses, and Potential Future Respondents: This section clarifies your specific obligations under this Affidavit, including duties related to Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests (5 U.S.C. § 552) and the olive branch redemption opportunity. These obligations stem from your roles in the documented harms, acquiescence by silence to unrebuted notices, and fiduciary duties to uphold federal supremacy. Failure to comply will result in escalation, including perfected UCC-1 liens, RICO referrals, IRS investigations, and potential criminal complaints.

All personal liability reductions or releases—even after fulfilling individual steps like apologies—are **contingent** on achieving broader systemic resolutions. These include: full discharge of the \$15 trillion federal ledger through settlement (e.g., via negotiable instruments), issuance of a bifurcated divorce decree, correction of all HHS and DHS records (including FOIA entries, wage garnishments, and administrative misrepresentations), vacation of void custody and support orders, transparent reporting of corrections to HHS, Treasury, and bonding agencies, voluntary resignation or transfer of the matter to proper oversight, sealing of the judgment ledger, referral of criminal matters to law enforcement (excluding redeemed parties), and reinstatement of my passport. Without these, no individual is fully discharged, as the harms continue to accrue.

Obligations are categorized below based on your status. If you believe you fit a different category, rebut via sworn affidavit within 10 days (final cutoff: January 18, 2026), or acquiesce by silence.

1. Special Case: Alene Wilmoth Reich (Private Respondent and Primary Litigant)

As the initiating party in the underlying harms (e.g., unilateral removal of offspring on March 28, 2021, fraudulent PFA filing, and conspiracy with Wendy Chan), you bear heightened accountability. However, recognizing our shared history and the potential for familial reconciliation, I extend a tailored olive branch grounded in grace (e.g., my personal letter acknowledging mutual hurts and proposing a Shared Parenting Plan per Ephesians 6:4).

- **Olive Branch Duties and Deadlines:**
 - Remove us from unlawful court matters
 - Sign the Shared Parenting plan
 - Return the kids by New Years Eve

Failure forfeits this path, exposing you to full \$25 million personal liability plus joint responsibility for the \$15 trillion, and full criminal exposure.

2. Excluded from Olive Branch: Judges, UJS Employees, Lancaster DRS Employees, Pennsylvania DHS Employees, Penn Glazier, Heather Adams, and David Sunday

You are core orchestrators of the fraud, malfeasance, and systemic violations (e.g., issuing void orders, obstructing justice, and aiding Title IV-D abuses). No redemption or reduced liability is offered—full accountability applies, including private capacity liability under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (stripping immunity per *Ex parte Young*).

- **FOIA Duties:** As public officials/entities, you must acknowledge receipt within 10 days and fully respond within 20 days to all requests (e.g., oaths, bonds, state plans, audits, communications). Include what is provided and justify any redactions/exclusions. Obstruction triggers 2x multipliers and criminal referrals (e.g., 18 U.S.C. § 1519).
- **Olive Branch:** Ineligible—no confession, apology, or pledge will reduce liability. You remain jointly and severally liable for your allocated share (e.g., \$25 million per individual, \$4 trillion for UJS/DHS entities).
- **Path Forward:** Comply with FOIA to mitigate escalation. Broader settlement (e.g., vacating orders, correcting records) is required for any discharge, but personal consequences (e.g., resignation, referrals) persist. Deadline for any negotiated entity-level settlement: January 29, 2026, or face perfected liens and offsets.

3. Special Case: Witnesses Involved in FOIA Requests (e.g., Federal HHS Officials like Robert F. Kennedy Jr., Michael B. Stuart, Christi A. Grimm; State Officials; Committees)

You are CC'd as witnesses with fiduciary duties to investigate/respond due to oversight roles (e.g., judiciary committees, HHS OIG). Many are implicated in FOIA requests for transparency (e.g., state plans, audits, bonds). Failure to act may elevate you to respondents.

- **FOIA Duties:** Acknowledge receipt within 10 days; provide full, unredacted responses within 20 days (e.g., Title IV-D reports, communications, funding ledgers). As federal/state entities, comply with 5 U.S.C. § 552 and 45 C.F.R. §§ 302–308. Non-response equals obstruction (2x multiplier) and potential dereliction referrals.
- **Olive Branch Duties and Deadlines:** Eligible if not otherwise excluded. Follow general steps: confession of oversight failures (e.g., ignoring federal supremacy violations), apology, pledge to enforce supremacy (e.g., via audits/investigations), and voluntary settlement (e.g., facilitate record corrections). Deadline: January 29, 2026. In return, forgive portion and avoid escalation to respondent status.
- **Contingency:** Liability ends only upon broader goals (e.g., ledger discharge via Treasury offsets, passport reinstatement). Inaction may trigger your inclusion in the 251+ respondents, with \$25 million allocation.

4. General Case: All Other Respondents and Witnesses (e.g., Private like Wendy Chan; Local Officials; Potential Future Respondents)

If not in above categories, you are general respondents/witnesses (e.g., attorneys, police chiefs, reps like Brett Miller/Lloyd Smucker positioned for honor). You have fiduciary duties to act but may redeem via olive branch.

- **FOIA Duties:** If targeted (e.g., for bonds, oaths, or records), acknowledge within 10 days; full response within 20 days. Non-applicable parties: No duty, but cooperate if requested to avoid escalation.
- **Olive Branch Duties and Deadlines:**
 - Confess specific wrongs (e.g., failing to intervene in color-of-law deprivations).
 - Apologize for harms.
 - Pledge to uphold federal supremacy in future work.
 - Settle voluntarily (e.g., negotiated portion of \$25 million).
 - Deadline: January 29, 2026. In return, substantial forgiveness and withdrawal from criminal matters.
- **Contingency:** Full release requires broader settlement (e.g., debt discharge, record corrections). Until then, liability accrues (e.g., \$46,656,000/day total).

5. Special Case: Federal Treasury and Related Officials (e.g., Secretary Bessent)

As facilitators with Limited Power of Attorney, if you accept the offer then you assume obligations focused on enforcement (e.g., UCC-1 perfection, TOP offsets). No olive branch needed—cooperation yields 25% facilitation fee (\$3.75T+) with a cap of \$5T.

- **Contingency:** Pursue all funds comprehensively; partial action voids fee. Supports broader goals like passport reinstatement.

GRAND JURY

18 U.S. Code § 3332 - Powers and duties

(a)It shall be the duty of each such grand jury impaneled within any judicial district to inquire into offenses against the criminal laws of the United States alleged to have been committed within that district. Such alleged offenses may be brought to the attention of the grand jury by the court or by any attorney appearing on behalf of the United States for the presentation of evidence. **Any such attorney receiving information concerning such an alleged offense from any other person shall, if requested by such other person , inform the grand jury of such alleged offense, the identity of such other person, and such attorney's action or recommendation.**

(b)Whenever the district court determines that the volume of business of the special grand jury exceeds the capacity of the grand jury to discharge its obligations, the district court may order an additional special grand jury for that district to be impaneled.

**PURSUANT TO 18 USC 3332 I AM ALLEGING
CRIMINAL OFFENSES AND ONCE AGAIN I
DEMAND A GRAND JURY CONVENE FOR
THESE CRIMES OR ALTERNATIVELY
COURTS-MARTIAL ARE CONVENED UNDER
THE LAW OF WAR AND CONSIDERATIONS OF
DEVOLUTION.**

DISCLAIMER

*I am not an expert in the law however I do know right from wrong. If there is any man or woman damaged by any statements herein, if he will inform me by facts I will sincerely make every effort to amend my ways. I hereby and herein reserve the right to amend and make amendments to this document as necessary, in order that the truth may be ascertained and proceedings justly determined. If the parties given notice by means of this document have information that would controvert and overcome this Affidavit, please advise me **IN WRITTEN AFFIDAVIT FORM within ten (10) days from receipt hereof** (final cutoff for all Respondents is January 18, 2026), providing me with your counter affidavit, proving with particularity by stating all requisite actual evidentiary fact and all requisite actual law, and not merely the ultimate facts or conclusions of law, that this Affidavit Statement is substantially and materially false sufficiently to change materially my status and factual declarations. Your silence stands as consent to, and tacit approval of, the declarations herein being established as fact of the matter of law. Any statement made about any portion of this document being incorrect will necessarily indicate that you believe all remaining portions of the document to be true to the best of your knowledge.*

Pursuant to 28 USC Section 1746(1)

“.. any matter is required or permitted to be supported, evidenced, established, or proved by the sworn declaration, verification, certificate, statement, oath, or affidavit, in writing of the person making the same, such matter may, with like force and effect, be supported, evidenced, establish, or proved by the unsworn declaration, certificate, verification, or statement, in writing of such person which is subscribed by him, as true under penalty of perjury, and dated, in substantially the following form..

(1)If executed without the United States: “I declare (or certify, verify, or state) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on (date).

(Signature)”.

(2)If executed within the United States, its territories, possessions, or commonwealths: “I declare (or certify, verify, or state) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on (date).

(Signature)”.

DECLARATION AND 28 USC 1746

I, reich: blair-jesse-ellyn, also known as blair of columbia, do hereby state that based upon my firsthand knowledge and information relayed to me from my ow research, this Affidavit is true, accurate, and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief by me the man/Trustor/Settlor/Agent to and beneficial owner of the Social Security Cestui que Trust / UCC 9 REGISTERED ORGANIZATION / INDIVIDUAL PROPRIETORSHIP, BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, *ens legis* as herein designated.

"I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on 12/22/2025."

AUTOGRAPH

WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND WITHOUT RECOURSE

Date: 12/22/2025

BY: /a/ reich: blair-jesse-ellyn, Man, Agent
Regarding BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, *ens legis*
and represented PERSON

Blair, Agent

With a heavenly domicile,
blairjesseellynreich@gmail.com
979-574-1577

The undisputed heavyweight champion of Sui Juris
Litigation
Sui Juris

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
LANCASTER COUNTY

Signed before me on 12/22/2025 (date)


By: Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich

Signature of notarial officer *Maria Antonia Ruperto*

Stamp

Title of Office

My Commission Expires:



This document available in PDF format at blackcollarcartel.com listed as "Convolutd Federal Supremacy" under "courses."

APPENDIX

LETTERS AND JUDICIAL NOTICE

BY:

reich: blair

two hundred and twenty seven cherry street
columbia, lancaster county, pennsylvania [republic]
979-574-1577

blairjesseellynreich@gmail.com

Free white man, Pennsylvanian, agent, Sui Juris

FOR:

BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH

227 CHERRY ST

COLUMBIA, PA 17512

ENS LEGIS, US PERSON, US CITIZEN, Pro Se

December Fifteen, Anno Domini two thousand and twenty-five, and of the Independence of the united States of America two hundred and forty-nine.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT For the EASTERN DISTRICT of PENNSYLVANIA

BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH

§

§ Civil Action No. 25-**CV**-5331

V

§

Debra Todd et al

§

§

JUDICIAL NOTICE OF SETTLEMENT LETTER AND PENDING FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

Comes now Blair of Columbia, man, agent and Sui Juris for BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, Pro Se and he declares the following-

1. He certifies he has sent this attached letter, enthusiastically titled "Convoluting Federal Supremacy," to opposing counsel (David and Sonya).
2. He gives judicial notice of the attached letter starting a commercial lien process, pending default, and settlement terms and options.
3. He gives judicial notice of intent to file an Amended Complaint in the New Year after Defendants inevitably enter commercial default (January 15, 2026) if they don't settle sooner (11:59pm on December 24, 2025).
4. Otherwise he wishes you many blessings of health, wellness, and celebration in this end of year Holiday time.

Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich
227 Cherry Street
Columbia, Pennsylvania [17512]

December 22, 2025

The Honorable Donald J. Trump
President of the United States
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable Scott Bessent
Secretary of the Treasury
U.S. Department of the Treasury
1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20220

Dear President Trump and Secretary Bessent,

I, Dr. Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich, am writing to you as a free white Pennsylvanian, to seek your urgent assistance in enforcing and collecting approximately \$15 trillion in accrued damages owed to me due to egregious violations of my God-given rights, constitutional protections, and federal statutes by a cartel of state actors in Pennsylvania. These harms stem from the unlawful abduction and restraint of my three offspring—IMR, EJR, and JFR—beginning March 28, 2021, facilitated by conspiracy, fraud, and malfeasance under color of law in family court proceedings (Reich v. Reich, involving PFA, divorce, custody, and support matters). The perpetrators, including judicial officers, attorneys, and entities like the Unified Judicial System of Pennsylvania (UJS), Pennsylvania Department of Human Services (DHS), and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, have engaged in treason, sedition, wire fraud, mail fraud, RICO violations (18 U.S.C. § 1962), and deprivations under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1985(3), all while operating ultra vires and in defiance of federal supremacy (U.S. Const. Art. VI).

Through un rebutted notices, affidavits of liability, and fee schedules served since April 2021, these actors have acquiesced to my claims by silence, establishing a binding commercial agreement under Pennsylvania's Uniform Commercial Code (13 Pa.C.S. §§ 2101–2725). Damages have been meticulously calculated using inflation-adjusted precedents like *Trezevant v. City of Tampa* (1994), incorporating base, incidental, consequential, punitive (tripled), and RICO-trebled amounts. For a single perpetrator, base damages alone exceed \$6.6 billion, multiplied across 251 respondents (and climbing) to reach \$15 trillion as of December 20, 2025, with daily accrual at rates such as \$8,100 per minute per person for unlawful restraint (totaling \$46,656,000 per day for my family). Escalating multipliers for stages (e.g., 10x for litigation) and events (e.g., 5x for additional crimes) ensure accountability for ongoing defiance.

To incentivize federal intervention and leverage the Treasury's fiscal authority, I hereby offer the United States Treasury one-quarter of the total damages—\$3.74 trillion—as a facilitation fee, contingent upon your assistance in collection and enforcement. This portion is capped at \$5 trillion if damages continue to escalate to disincentive the Treasury from allowing the damages to increase while recognizing the Treasury's role in monetizing obligations under federal reserve mechanisms (12 U.S.C. § 411) and offsetting against state funds (31 U.S.C. § 3716). The remaining damages are distributed as follows: \$25 million per individual respondent (\$6.275 billion total), with the balance allocated to systemic entities (\$4 trillion to UJS, \$4 trillion to DHS, \$3.26 trillion to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania). All parties are jointly and severally liable.

Your administration's support is crucial to untangle this "convoluted federal supremacy," as one perpetrator ironically described it. Specifically, I authorize and request the following:

- Establish a Treasury Direct Account in my name and share access details with me.
- Perfect and certify UCC-1 liens securing the \$15 trillion against the debtors
- Utilize the Treasury Offset Program (TOP) to claw back federal funds, including Title IV-D incentives, ledger discrepancies, and misappropriated revenues (e.g., \$232,000 in seized wages and unknown disbursements).
- Accept and monetize promissory notes or bills of exchange from respondents, converting them to Federal Reserve Notes or credits payable to me, with administrative fees at the Federal Reserve Discount Window Rate.
- Enforce through administrative offset, salary offset, tax refund intercept, and self-help remedies under UCC §§ 9-601, 9-609, and 9-625.
- Encourage changes to federal and state law to honor Federal Supremacy and stop despotic and unconstitutional aspects of family law.

Assuming your participation; I grant you, Secretary Bessent, and your agents a Limited Power of Attorney solely for these purposes, conditioned on pursuing all funds comprehensively (not selectively) and remitting 75% of proceeds to me after your 25% facilitation fee. This authorization is revocable at my discretion, with all rights reserved, including Gracefully reducing liabilities for cooperating respondents. This offer expires on February 28, 2025.

This is not merely a personal matter; similar claims may exist for countless families victimized by Title IV-D abuses. By acting decisively, you can restore justice, deter systemic corruption, and secure a substantial windfall for the Treasury to support national priorities. I urge you to respond within 10 days and initiate enforcement immediately, as delays compound the harms. Failure to act will necessitate further escalation across state and federal agencies, but I remain hopeful for your patriotic intervention partially inspired by net proceeds of 3.75T USD.

All rights reserved without prejudice, UCC § 1-308.

Respectfully submitted for your consideration,

Dr. Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich

Dr. Blair Reich
227 Cherry Street
Columbia, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania [Republic]
979-574-1577
blairjesseellynreich@gmail.com

December 22, 2025

The Honorable Lloyd J. Austin III
Secretary of Defense
U.S. Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1000

CC:
Department of Defense Inspector General Hotline
4800 Mark Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22350-1500
Hotline: 1-800-424-9098
Email: hotline@dodig.mil

Re: Urgent Request for Courts-Martial Proceedings Against the "Black Collar Cartel" Under Wartime Authority, Pursuant to the Devolution Framework and Department of Defense Law of War Manual

Dear Secretary Austin,

I am Dr. Blair Reich, a free White Pennsylvanian and author of *Convoluting Federal Supremacy*, a comprehensive affidavit and exposé detailing systemic abuses within Pennsylvania's family court system, particularly in Lancaster County. This letter serves as a formal request for the Department of Defense (DoD) to initiate courts-martial proceedings against a network of state judicial, administrative, and law enforcement officials—whom I term the "Black Collar Cartel"—for their roles in perpetrating constitutional violations, racketeering, and acts tantamount to treason against me and my family. These harms, meticulously documented in my book, include wrongful Protection From Abuse (PFA) orders, asymmetric custody deprivations, fraudulent child support enforcements, and obstructions of federal civil rights lawsuits under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, resulting in large financial damages.

My request is grounded in the ongoing "Devolution" operation, as articulated in Patel Patriot's (Jon Herold) extensive Substack series, which posits that President Donald J. Trump, anticipating foreign interference in the 2020 election, activated classified continuity of government (COG) protocols to decentralize federal authority to the U.S. military. This framework establishes Trump as a wartime president, operating covertly to counter an "invisible enemy" of election manipulation, primarily attributed to adversaries like China. Key elements

include Executive Order 13848 (addressing foreign election interference), which declared a national emergency, and related orders such as 13912 (mobilizing reserves), 13961 (federal mission resilience), and 13919 (National Guard activation). These actions, per the theory, invoked Presidential Emergency Action Documents (PEADs) from Cold War-era plans, effectively suspending normal civilian governance while maintaining its appearance, with military command ensuring the restoration of legitimate authority.

This devolution aligns with the *Department of Defense Law of War Manual* (updated July 2023), the official U.S. government doctrine governing conduct during armed conflict. The Manual underscores the President's role as Commander-in-Chief (U.S. Const. Art. II, § 2), with the Secretary of Defense as principal advisor (10 U.S.C. § 113), directing military operations through the chain of command. In wartime or national emergencies, military authority can support civilian functions under statutes like the Insurrection Act (10 U.S.C. §§ 251-255) or National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. §§ 1601-1651), but civilian supremacy remains paramount (DoD Directive 5100.01). However, in scenarios of foreign aggression—such as cyber-enabled election interference equated to an act of war—the Manual allows for heightened military oversight to preserve constitutional government (National Security Presidential Directive 51/HSPD-20 on COG). During such periods, apparent civilian operations may stem from military authority, with the Commander-in-Chief and Secretary of Defense holding ultimate control to neutralize domestic threats aiding foreign enemies or effectuating domestic treason.

The Black Collar Cartel—comprising judges like Supreme Court Chief Justice Debra Todd Retired Senior Judge William P. Mahon, President Judge David L. Ashworth; Domestic Relations officials like Gary Kline; and enablers in the Pennsylvania judiciary as well as in the federal government—has engaged in acts that constitute collaboration with this wartime threat. There's over 250 people I accused of treason because they're deliberately waging war on the constitution.

By abusing Title IV-D incentives (42 U.S.C. § 651 et seq.) to fabricate orders, seize assets without due process (violating U.S. Const. Amend. XIV), and obstruct federal remedies, they have inflicted irreparable harm: along with protection from abuse orders based on false narratives, asymmetric custody orders, outrageous support orders, and refusal to allow my divorce to proceed to keep me in the system longer they have suppressed habeas corpus petitions. The main system operates by intentionally depriving me and similarly situated fathers of constitutional rights to Due Notice, Substantive and Procedural Due Process, Equal Protection, Neutral Arbitration, Fairness and ultimately Justice as a first step and then a subsequent step of depriving us of our property and parental rights. Trillions of dollars are implicated and it's happening under the dutiful watch of the US Military.

These actions not only breach federal supremacy (U.S. Const. Art. VI; *Cooper v. Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1 (1958)) but are literal acts of Treason and Sedition. The people responsible are the people I would otherwise appeal to for help. This system is deeply corrupt and I believe the military is the only way to clean this mess up. When you grab the constitutional bull by 18 U.S.C. § 2381 and 2384 you get the horns.

These are judges. They know what they're doing. Show no mercy.

Under the devolution paradigm and Law of War Manual, the military retains jurisdiction over such wartime offenses, even if perpetrated by civilians (Manual § 18.9 on courts-martial for aiding enemies). I request immediate investigation by the DoD Inspector General and convening of courts-martial under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (10 U.S.C. §§ 801-946) against the cartel members listed in my book. Enclosed is a copy of *Convoluting Federal Supremacy* for your review.

Failure to act perpetuates this cartel's racketeering, leading to irreparable harm to me and millions of fathers like me, eroding the Republic Trump sought to protect. I await your prompt response and am available for further discussion.

Sincerely,

Dr. Blair Reich

Enclosure: *Convoluting Federal Supremacy* (Affidavit and Book)

Dear Alene,

I hope this letter finds you in a moment of peace amidst the storm we've been navigating. As I sit down to write this, I'm reminded of the spirit of Retrouvaille—the program we both know from the Catholic faith, designed to help couples like us face our hurts openly, with gentleness and love, so we can heal and rebuild. It's about confronting the pain we've caused each other, not to assign blame, but to understand, forgive, and move forward together. That's the heart I want to bring to these words, even as we address the deep wounds in our marriage.

First, let me start by expressing my gratitude and love. Despite all our difficulties, we've been blessed beyond measure with a miraculous portion by and through our beautiful children. They are the greatest gift God has given us, a Testament to the love we once shared so freely. Watching them grow, seeing their smiles, their curiosity, and their kindness—it's a reminder that even in our brokenness, we've created something truly amazing and whole. They are our legacy, and it's a profound Blessing to share in their lives. I cherish memories of us as a family, and I know you do too. Our children deserve parents who can come together for their sake, showing them what Grace looks like.

I want to acknowledge the hurts I've caused you, Alene, and take as much responsibility for them as I can. My career choices led to constant moves, uprooting our lives time and again, which created instability and made it hard for you to put down roots or feel secure. That was unfair to you, and I see now how it eroded the foundation we were building. Worse still, my struggle with alcoholism brought deep indignities and pain into our home—moments of unfairness, anger, and neglect that you didn't deserve. These were my failings, and they've contributed to the challenges we face today. I'm sorry for the ways I've let you down, and I ask for your forgiveness, just as Retrouvaille teaches us to do: openly, humbly, and as I stand on a ten year record of personal change and growth.

At the same time, in the spirit of honest dialogue, I need to gently share how your actions have hurt me and our family. Taking the children for prolonged periods and pursuing family law orders through what I believe is a corrupt system—the "Black Collar Cartel" as I've come to understand it—has presented a comparable unreasonable challenge. It's created division, fear, and separation that echoes the instability I once caused, but in a different form. I know you're acting out of your own pain and perhaps a desire to protect what you hold dear, but it's deepened the rift between us and affected our children's sense of security and their literal well being. I prefer my children with their health intact and these issues between us are causing them needless deep psychological and emotional harm and it's showing up as physical ailments.

We've both made accusations and incurred damages—financial and emotional. I've accused you of actions that I see as criminal, and I know that's caused you worry. While I'm past the point of waiving the financial claims, as I believe accountability is necessary there, I want to extend one final opportunity for Grace in the spirit of our shared responsibility for our children's upbringing. This is your last chance for me to waive pursuing criminal charges. If we don't take this path, the consequences will unfold as to your choice of path, potentially leading to prison

time for reflection on your actions, and ultimately, I believe, full custody for me. The people you've aligned yourself with are not only foolish and arrogant, but doomed for their unlawful choices. They're judges and elected officials and they should know better and just like Judge Dugan found out they're not immune from criminal activity. Neither are you.

So, part of me is upset that you've been driving these decisions for years on end, but part of me sees how you can also be a victim of circumstance as these people preyed on your emotions, encouraged your behavior, and allowed it to continue well beyond reasonableness. So, I'm conflicted on this one, but ultimately believe that deliberately choosing Grace and Forgiveness is the Righteous option. You can blow me off one last time, but I think there's horrific consequences if you should choose that path.

And I don't want that for you, for me, or for our kids. Retrouvaille reminds us that healing comes from choosing love over vengeance, and I implore you, for the sake of our children, to stand down as I've been asking since the beginning: Stop taking the kids away, avoid the corrupt legal channels, and let's resolve the rest privately, as friends and former family.

To accept this opportunity of Grace, I ask you to take these steps, which I believe will pave the way for true reconciliation:

- Withdraw your request for equitable distribution, as you've already received more than a fair portion through our prior arrangements.
- Agree to a simple Decree for Divorce as both of us deserve to move past this.
- Withdraw your request for support, recognizing that the process is unfair, unjust, and deprives me of my fundamental rights as a parent, my religious freedoms, my right to free speech, and my property rights.
- We'll meet and sign the attached Shared Parenting Plan in the office of a public notary, which ensures we both remain actively involved in our children's lives, fostering the stability they need.
- Bring the kids back to my house on December 31st, 2025 and allow me New Years Eve with them and then we go back to our 2022 schedule under a shared parenting plan.

If you do this, your damages will be limited to the financial realm, where the path is already set, but we can avoid the criminal elements altogether. "Convoluting Federal Supremacy," as outlined in the affidavit, will hold everyone accountable if we continue down this road and the stakes are rather high—but let's choose a different path, one of Mercy and mutual respect.

I wouldn't be alive on this planet if you hadn't cared for me during my extended illness with alcohol. I'm deeply grateful and honor that my choices put a substantial burden to you and on you; especially as a mother with young children. Alene, I would choose a different path for you than the harsh one we're currently. I will gladly choose peace and gentleness should you meet me half way.

Ultimately, call me a fool, but I still believe in us, in the vows we made before God, friends and family, and in the possibility of a renewed friendship. We pledged each other mutual support because we didn't have anything else to offer. Though the form of that support has to change drastically because of our present and current circumstances; the foundation can still be one of kindness, friendship, peace, good will, and mutual support. I think it's still possible. I think with the right attitude we can achieve it. Imagine the peace we could bring to our children, the example we'd set for them by choosing Forgiveness over fighting and collaboration over conflict.

Faith calls us to this simple but difficult task: to love one another as Christ loves us, flaws and all. Let's honor that by coming together. I'm still here, I'm still asking for peace, and still offering to work through this as gently as we can, and to build a future where our children thrive with us both. I suppose I'll know by New Year's what path you've chosen.

Sincerely,

Your Still Lawfully Bound Husband,

Shared Parenting Plan

Preamble: Biblical Foundation for Family Unity

In the spirit of divine wisdom and the sacred bond of family as ordained by God, we, Dr. Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich and Alene Wilmoth, enter this Shared Parenting Plan guided by Scripture. As it is written in Ephesians 6:4, "Fathers, do not provoke your children to anger, but bring them up in the discipline and instruction of the Lord," and in Malachi 2:15, "Did he not make them one, with a portion of the Spirit in their union? And what was the one God seeking? Godly offspring. So guard yourselves in your spirit, and let none of you be faithless to the wife of your youth." We recognize that children are a heritage from the Lord (Psalm 127:3), and both parents are called to nurture them with love, respect, and cooperation. This plan honors God's design for family, seeking peace and mutual respect as commanded in Colossians 3:20-21 and Proverbs 22:6, to train up our children in the way they should go, free from conflict and division.

Recitals

1. **Acknowledgment of Past Conflict and Path to Peace:** We acknowledge that our marriage has endured a protracted and high-conflict divorce, marked by legal battles, emotional strain, and disruptions to our family. However, we now commit to ending this chapter through a peaceful, private, and voluntary Shared Parenting Plan. This agreement represents our mutual desire to move forward without further court intervention, prioritizing harmony and the well-being of our children over past grievances. By entering this plan, we release the need for adversarial proceedings and embrace a collaborative future.
2. **Importance of Both Parents in Children's Lives:** We affirm that both parents are essential to the healthy growth, development, and emotional security of our three marital progeny: I.M.R., E.J.R., and J.F.R. Children thrive with the active involvement of a loving mother and father, and we respect that our kids need their whole family—both parents, extended relatives, and a stable environment—to flourish. This plan ensures equal access to both parents, fostering strong bonds and recognizing that depriving children of either parent harms their spirit, as guided by biblical principles of family unity.

Terms of the Shared Parenting Plan

The following terms mirror the consensual custody arrangement we reached on December 7, 2022, which we both agreed to on the record. These provisions are adopted herein as binding contractual obligations between us.

I. Legal Custody

We shall share legal custody of I.M.R., E.J.R., and J.F.R. ("Children"). Each of us shall have the right to participate in major decisions affecting the Children, including but not limited to medical, religious, and educational decisions. We shall have equal access to medical, dental, and school records, as well as the residence address and telephone number of the Children and each other. The parent with primary physical custody at the time shall provide the other with advance information on a timely basis regarding school programs, events, meetings, and teacher conferences involving the Children. Neither of us shall make any significant decisions relating to legal custody without the assent of the other, except in the event of an emergency.

II. Physical Custody

A. We shall share physical custody of the Children on a 2-2-3 static schedule as follows:

1. Alene Wilmoth ("Mother") shall have physical custody every Monday at school until Wednesday at school.
2. Dr. Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich ("Father") shall have physical custody every Wednesday at school until Friday at school.
3. We shall alternate weekends from Friday at school until Monday at school.
4. If there is no school on any day that we are exchanging custody, then the exchange shall occur at 8 a.m., unless we agree otherwise.

III. Holidays & Vacations

A. **Holidays:**

1. Every year, Mother shall have custody on the first weekend in May from Friday at 7 p.m. until Sunday at 8 a.m.
2. Every year, Father shall have custody on Thanksgiving Day during his regularly scheduled custodial time.
3. Every year, Father shall have custody on New Year's Eve at 7 p.m. until New Year's Day at 8 a.m.
4. All other holidays shall be subject to the regular physical custody schedule unless we agree otherwise.

B. **Mother's Vacations:**

1. Mother shall have custody on the 31st week of every year from Friday at 7 p.m. until the following Friday at 7 p.m., unless we can agree otherwise.
2. Mother shall have custody during the Children's spring break from school, including both weekends that abut the academic week of spring break.

C. Father's Vacations:

1. Every June, Father shall have a period of ten (10) consecutive days of custody that encompasses two consecutive weekends. By default this vacation will encompass the last full week of June.
2. Every July, Father shall have a Monday and Tuesday period of custody in the same week, upon providing Mother with thirty (30) days of advanced written notice. The practical effect of this provision is to allow Father an uninterrupted week of vacation with the Children preceding or following his weekend period of custody. By default this is the last full week of July.

IV. Other Provisions

A. We agree to continue counseling for children so long as either parent or child wants it.

B. We agree that children can enroll in the school of their choice.

C. Each of us shall immediately notify the other by telephone of any serious illness or other emergency that may arise while the Children are in his or her custody.

D. Each of us shall encourage the Children to love and respect the other parent. Neither of us shall make or allow others to make any disparaging or derogatory remarks about the absent parent in the presence of the Children, regardless of whether such derogatory remarks were stated directly to the Children or whether we or a third party did not intend for the Children to hear the remarks.

E. Each of us is encouraged to accommodate the reasonable requests of the other for alterations of this plan, as the circumstances and the best interests of the Children may require.

F. Each of us agrees to act in Good Faith and to allow some Grace when God laughs at our plans and they don't go according to the design.

G. The terms of this Shared Parenting Plan may be modified at any time upon our mutual consent and presented as written addendums to this agreement to be included as part of this agreement.

H. This agreement extends until all three children have attained the age of majority with each child being removed from the Agreement on their 18th birthday at which point they are free to choose how they want the logistics of their life (within reason) to play out.

Additional Provisions for Balance and Enforcement

5. **Reserved Custody Time for Balance:** Recognizing that Mother has previously taken approximately 1.5 years of custody from Father, in the spirit of balance and fairness, Father reserves the right to take up to 1.5 years of additional custody time in week-long chunks during summers and school vacations. This shall be scheduled with at least thirty (30) days' advance notice to Mother and shall not conflict with her existing plans.
6. **Consequences for Breach:** Should Mother at any time act in bad faith and unilaterally take the Children without a reasonable reason—such as emergencies or actions that are not motivated by lying, spite, cruelty, malice, or entitlement but represent a meaningful and timely intervention for the benefit of the Children—she shall face criminal consequences without forgiveness. Exceptions apply if Father relapses into alcohol use or physically or sexually harms her or the Children.

Relocation Notice

If either of us proposes to relocate to another area with the Children, we must comply with the requirements of Section 5337 of the Pennsylvania Custody Law, which includes sending notice of the proposed move to the other and providing specific information concerning the relocation. The law may be found at 23 Pa.C.S.A. § 5337. Failure to comply with the notice provision or provide the required information may result in the court considering such failure as an element in any custody or relocation decision.

Autographs

We, the life long parents to three beautiful children, agree to the terms of this Shared Parenting Plan as a binding contract between us, entered into voluntarily and in good faith.

Dr. Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich

Alene Wilmoth

Date: _____

Date: _____

Notary Acknowledgment

State of Pennsylvania

County of Lancaster

On this ____ day of _____, **2025**, before me, a Notary Public, personally appeared Dr. Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich and Alene Wilmoth, known to me (or satisfactorily proven) to be the

persons whose names are subscribed to the foregoing instrument, and acknowledged that they executed the same for the purposes therein contained.

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

Notary Public

My Commission Expires: _____

BAR GRIEVANCE

- Ashworth, David L.: Bar ID 020587
- Auclair, Robert A.: No Bar ID Found
- Avalli, Charles Joseph: No Bar ID Found
- Barrett, Michael F.: Bar ID 42305
- Bearinger, Clark A.: Bar ID 203682
- Benner Jr., William E.: Bar ID 12182
- Bender, John E.: Bar ID 12182
- Bennett, Scott Alan: Bar ID 23287
- Bixler, Miles K.: Bar ID 203682
- Black, Seth Thomas: Bar ID 203075
- Bole, Jessica: No Bar ID Found
- Bole, Matthew Allen: Bar ID 311642
- Bongiovanni IV, Joseph N.: Bar ID 84311
- Book, Harris: Bar ID 203075
- Bowes, Mary Jane: Bar ID 26357
- Brennan, William J.: Bar ID 23373
- Brobson, P. Kevin: Bar ID 60007
- Brown III, Leonard G.: Bar ID 094205 (approximate from similar searches; confirm as judge)
- Brown, Todd E.: Bar ID 85543
- Buchanan, Butler: Bar ID 60007
- Cahall, Robert James: Bar ID 308767
- Callahan II, Timothy W.: Bar ID 56391
- Casale, Henry M.: Bar ID 34284
- Cassidy, Maureen: Bar ID 308154
- Chavis, Jenni Henley: Bar ID 84311
- Chiacchio, Thomas Henry: Bar ID 83197
- Chong, Jimmy C.: Bar ID 202024
- Chudzik, Brian E.: Bar ID 203682
- Cimini, Vincent: Bar ID 60463
- Ciprero, Francis N.: Bar ID 90250
- Cognetti, Maria P.: Bar ID 62650
- Comisky, Hope Ann: Bar ID 26357
- Commins, B. Denise: Bar ID 203682
- Conrad, Jeffrey A.: Bar ID 65228
- Cosgrove, Patrick Joseph: Bar ID 307222
- Daller, Nicole Anne: Bar ID 310545
- Dapper, Kathleen Patricia: Bar ID 73288
- Devine, Evelyn Rodriguez: Bar ID 52632
- Doherty, Timothy Michael: Bar ID 65228
- Donohue, Christine: Bar ID 32349

- Dougherty, Kevin M.: Bar ID 57175
- Early, Elizabeth C.: Bar ID 311782
- Earnest, Phillip Ray: Bar ID 85543
- Edger, Paul D.: Bar ID 200372
- Edwards, Victoria Porcel: Bar ID 200372
- Fisher, Jennifer Krause: No Bar ID Found
- Ford, Zanetta Maree: Bar ID 87080
- Froetschel, Joseph Regis: Bar ID 203682
- Gallia, Anthony Louis: Bar ID 86029
- Giorgione, Andrew J.: Bar ID 75352
- Giurintano, Jason C.: Bar ID 89177
- Glazier, Penn:
- Good, Peter M.: Bar ID 1758
- Goodheart, Mark Bradley: Bar ID 203651
- Goulding Jr., Allan D.: Bar ID 65296
- Gray, Denis Aloysius: Bar ID 61054
- Greene, Lance Deshawn Jason: Bar ID 317761
- Gromen, Richard:
- Grunfeld, Kenneth Jay: Bar ID 84121
- Hackman, Christopher A.: Bar ID 080606
- Han, John Sung Jin: No Bar ID Found
- Harrington, Catherine Nora: Bar ID 318325
- Heisse, Jonathan: Bar ID 206234
- Hess, Michael D.: Bar ID 63650
- Higgins Jr., James Clifford: Bar ID 35900
- Hof, Philip Marsh: Bar ID 75352
- Howell, Jordan Lyles: Bar ID 92678
- Hughes, Elizabeth L.: Bar ID 79428
- Hughes, Lauren Ashley: Bar ID 318325
- Jackson, Damia S.: Bar ID 92678
- Jensen, Debra Andrea: Bar ID 33598
- Johnston, Jillian Elizabeth: Bar ID 65252
- Keller, Joshua R.: Bar ID 203682
- Kennedy, Paul J.: Bar ID 39291
- Kirkham, Amy Michelle: Bar ID 68343
- Knisely, Howard F.: Bar ID 32377
- Koltash, Jonathan David: Bar ID 206234
- Krawitz, Jeffrey Allen: Bar ID 49530
- Kumer, Aimee L.: Bar ID 84121
- Landis, Torrey J.: Bar ID 203682
- Landau, Brent William: Bar ID 311501
- Lazarus, Anne E.: Bar ID 32349
- Lee, Sophia: Bar ID 90101
- LeFever, Andrew: Bar ID 317642

- Lichtenstein, Jason Mark: Bar ID 68280
- Lionetti, Mark Gerar: Bar ID 62083
- Mallon, Teresa A.: Bar ID 73210
- Mankin II, William R.: Bar ID 203682
- Marritz, Donald: Bar ID 14932
- Marteny, Katharine Stone: Bar ID 326697
- Mazaheri, Tina: Bar ID 65228
- McCaffery, Daniel D.: Bar ID 65228
- McCarrie II, James Joseph: No Bar ID Found
- McConnell, Carrie Jardim: Bar ID 311501
- McDonnell, Thomas A.: No Bar ID Found
- McNichol, Danielle Peyakovich: Bar ID 90101
- Medure, Jason Alan: Bar ID 90976
- Miller, Margaret C.: Bar ID 64296
- Miller, Randall L.: Bar ID 62083
- Miley, Tyesha Colleen: Bar ID 84311
- Monson, Courtney M.: Bar ID 203682
- Morgan, Colin Adair: Bar ID 308236
- Morrison, Veronica Lee: Bar ID 310095
- Mundy, Sallie Updyke: Bar ID 50081
- Nolan, Renee Andrea: Bar ID 2108488
- O'Brien, Patrice Smith: No Bar ID Found
- Ober Jr., Russell John: Bar ID 16156
- Ott, Jason Louis: Bar ID 307212
- Owhe, Joan E.: Bar ID 331123
- Pagac, Shelly Renee: Bar ID 73288
- Penetar Jr., Daniel Lawrence: Bar ID 328611
- Perry, Mark Thomas: Bar ID 64296
- Pierotti, A. Lisa: Bar ID 77461
- Polishan, Timothy Paul: Bar ID 76247
- Rampaul, Beverly Heather: Bar ID 308727
- Raphael, Kevin E.: Bar ID 84121
- Rassias, George Gerasimos: Bar ID 75352
- Reich, Jeffery J.: Bar ID 65228
- Reinaker, Dennis E.: Bar ID 020587
- Rosenthal, Adam Samuel: Bar ID 65228
- Sadler, Christine Marie: Bar ID 326697
- Santarelli, Raymond J.: Bar ID 79428
- Sembach, Matthew Alan: Bar ID 308236
- Shicora, Kristin Elizabeth: Bar ID 311820
- Smith, Eric B.: Bar ID 64352
- Spahn Jr., Merrill M.: Bar ID 65189
- Sponaule, Thomas B.: Bar ID 64584
- Spry II, Donald F.: Bar ID 16156

- Stauffer, Joseph C.: Bar ID 203682
- Steadman, Craig W.: Bar ID 086106
- Stein, Neil Andrew: Bar ID 68693
- Stevens, Correale F.: Bar ID 35900
- Sullivan, Francis J.: Bar ID 79428
- Sweeney, Tomas N.: Bar ID 65228
- Szostak, Robert Thaddeus: Bar ID 65228
- Tancredi, Dawn M.: Bar ID 68343
- Tepper, David: Bar ID 308767
- Thynhart, Daniel Erik: Bar ID 78248
- Todd, Debra: Bar ID 37537
- Totaro, Donald R.: Bar ID 032906
- Turner, Michele E.: Bar ID 68343
- Villari, Heidi: Bar ID 82771
- Walsh, Joseph Patrick: Bar ID 64352
- Wecht, David N.: Bar ID 68693
- Weber, Melissa Murphy: Bar ID 65228
- Wechsler, Christine: No Bar ID Found (from earlier)
- Wenge, Keld Rolf: Bar ID 206181
- Witkonis, Adam J.: Bar ID 311642
- Wright, Jeffery D.: Bar ID 032906
- Zeiger, Brian J.: Bar ID 87063

(Note: Some IDs were not explicitly in snippets; used best match from responses or noted as not found. Judges' IDs are included as they are licensed attorneys.)

Bar Grievance Against All Respondents

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

In the Matter of the Grievances Against the Respondents Listed in the Affidavit Entitled
"Professional Grievances and Reviews - Convoluted Federal Supremacy"

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner, Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich, a living man and aggrieved party, petitions this Honorable Court to review and redress the egregious misconduct, ethical violations, and systemic abuses perpetrated by the respondents as detailed in the attached 200-page affidavit. The affidavit exposes a coordinated "Black Collar Cartel" of judicial and legal actors who have flagrantly disregarded federal supremacy, engaged in treasonous acts through Title IV-D abuses, and facilitated interstate human trafficking and racketeering under color of law. This pattern of corruption demands immediate disbarment, sanctions, and referral for criminal prosecution to restore public trust in the legal profession.

Questions Presented

1. Whether the respondents' willful defiance of the Supremacy Clause (U.S. Const. Art. VI, cl. 2) by prioritizing state statutes over federal law constitutes grounds for disbarment under Pa.R.P.C. 8.4(b) (criminal acts) and 8.4(c) (dishonesty, fraud, deceit).
2. Whether the alleged misuse of family courts for financial gain via Title IV-D incentives violates federal statutes (e.g., 42 U.S.C. § 651 et seq.) and ethical rules, warranting permanent revocation of licenses.
3. Whether the respondents' failure to report or address known ethical breaches among peers breaches Pa.R.P.C. 8.3(a) (reporting professional misconduct), meriting severe discipline.

Statement of the Case

The affidavit, dedicated to Retired Senior Judge William P. Mahon and encompassing 251 respondents, meticulously documents a conspiracy to subvert federal supremacy in family law proceedings (Reich v. Reich). Respondents have issued void orders, obstructed justice, and profited from Title IV-D abuses, constituting racketeering (18 U.S.C. § 1962), human trafficking, and treason. Specific violations include ignoring constitutional protections, fleecing parties, and failing to enforce supreme law, resulting in \$15 trillion in damages. As licensed attorneys, respondents are bound by Pa.R.P.C., yet their actions demonstrate criminal intent, fraud, and professional dereliction.

Reasons for Granting the Writ

This Court must intervene to dismantle this cartel and prevent further erosion of judicial integrity. The misconduct is not isolated but systemic, affecting countless families and undermining public confidence. Disbarment is imperative under Pa.R.D.E. 217, with mandatory referrals to federal authorities for prosecution. Failure to act perpetuates injustice and violates this Court's duty to regulate the bar.

Submitted,

Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich

[Date: December 22, 2025]

JUDICIAL REVIEW

List of Judges (Alphabetical by Last Name):

- Ashworth, David L.
- Bearinger, Clark A.
- Benner Jr., William E.
- Bender, John E.
- Bixler, Miles K.
- Bowes, Mary Jane
- Brobson, P. Kevin
- Brown III, Leonard G.
- Brown, Todd E.
- Chudzik, Brian E.
- Commins, B. Denise
- Conrad, Jeffrey A.
- Donohue, Christine
- Dougherty, Kevin M.
- Hackman, Christopher A.
- Heisse, Jonathan
- Hess, Michael D.
- Keller, Joshua R.
- Knisely, Howard F.
- Landis, Torrey J.
- Lazarus, Anne E.
- LeFever, Andrew
- Mahon, William P.
- Mankin II, William R.
- McCaffery, Daniel D.
- McLaughlin, Shawn P.
- Miller, Margaret C.
- Miller, Randall L.
- Monson, Courtney M.
- Mundy, Sallie Updyke
- Murphy, JoAnne
- Parsons, Christina
- Reich, Jeffery J.
- Reinaker, Dennis E.
- Reibman, Edward D.
- Richardson, Jodie E.
- Sheller, Raymond S.
- Spahn Jr., Merrill M.
- Sponaugle, Mary Mongiovi

- Sponaugle, Thomas B.
- Stauffer, Joseph C.
- Steadman, Craig W.
- Stevens, Correale F.
- Todd, Debra
- Totaro, Donald R.
- Wecht, David N.
- Witkonis, Adam J.
- Wright, Jeffery D.

Mass Judicial Review Against Judges

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

In the Matter of Judicial Review of the Conduct of Listed Judges in the Affidavit Entitled "Judicial Review- Convoluted Federal Supremacy"

PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW

Petitioner, Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich, petitions this Court for certiorari to investigate and sanction the listed judges for their role in a pervasive scheme of judicial misconduct, as chronicled in the 200-page affidavit. These judges have abdicated their oath, enabling a "Black Collar Cartel" that defies federal supremacy, perpetrates treason via Title IV-D exploitation, and inflicts irreparable harm on families through void orders and rights violations. Immediate removal, disbarment, and criminal referrals are essential to purge this corruption from the judiciary.

Questions Presented

1. Whether the judges' systematic disregard for the Supremacy Clause and federal law in family proceedings warrants impeachment and disbarment under Pa. Const. Art. VI and Pa.R.J.C.P. 701.
2. Whether their facilitation of racketeering and human trafficking through court abuses violates 18 U.S.C. § 1962 and judicial canons, demanding lifetime bans.
3. Whether failure to self-report or halt peer misconduct breaches Pa.R.J.C.P. 201, necessitating structural reforms to prevent recurrence.

Statement of the Case

The affidavit exposes judges' complicity in subverting federal law in Reich v. Reich, issuing fraudulent orders, denying due process, and profiting from Title IV-D incentives. This treasonous conduct has caused \$15 trillion in damages, eroding public trust and violating constitutional mandates.

Reasons for Granting the Review

The judiciary's integrity is compromised; these judges have weaponized courts for personal gain, demanding swift excision. This Court must enforce accountability to safeguard justice, with referrals to federal authorities for prosecution.

Submitted,

Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich

[Date: December 22, 2025]

DEFICIENCIES AND IRREGULARITIES

In the labyrinth of family law proceedings that have ensnared my life since March 2021, a series of court orders have been issued against me by the Lancaster County Court of Common Pleas and related entities. These orders, spanning protection from abuse (PFA), custody, child support, and asset seizures, uniformly exhibit profound deficiencies and irregularities. They violate fundamental constitutional rights at both federal and state levels, including due notice, procedural and substantive due process under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, equal protection under the law, and the right to neutral arbitration free from bias or collusion. Each order lacks proper evidentiary foundation, ignores my unrebutted affidavits and notices, and demonstrates a pattern of ex parte decision-making, misapplication of rules, and willful disregard for my status as a living man with unalienable rights. Critically, these actions persist despite my explicit Notice of Liability and Fee Schedule served in April 2021 (and reinforced in subsequent affidavits), which outlined fines for trespassing on my property (including my offspring) and administering it without consent. By continuing to issue and enforce these flawed orders without rebuttal or remedy, the court and its officers have tacitly accepted my terms, building a record of liability that accrues daily.

I group these orders by family law category below, highlighting representative examples from the docket (drawn from case numbers like CI-21-02607 for custody, CI-21-02064 and CI-21-02608 for PFA, and 2021-00333/PACSES 967300735 for support). This is a partial list, as the full record spans hundreds of pages of filings, but even this subset illustrates systemic failure. Each grouping represents a total breakdown of legal integrity, turning the judicial process into a tool of oppression rather than justice.

To dismantle these abominations, I apply the LEX-CIVIX Hierarchical-Framework Methodology—a revolutionary structure that pins down vampyric cartel judges with metaphorical wooden stakes, fusing Biblical mandates, core foundational legal frameworks (Constitution, USC, CFR, case law, court rules), secondary frameworks (UCC/commercial, parallel state elements, facts and circumstances via detailed timeline), and culminating in a remedy framework. This exposes each order as not just flawed, but a treasonous assault on divine and legal order, demanding immediate vacatur, personal liability, and federal escalation. The court's silence on my unrebutted notices since April 2021 constitutes tacit acceptance, accruing billions in fines enforceable via liens or common law courts (per *Trezevant v. City of Tampa* precedents).

1. Protection from Abuse (PFA) Orders

These orders, ostensibly designed to protect against harm, were weaponized for custodial advantage without evidence of abuse, violating due process by granting temporary relief ex parte and dismissing counterclaims without hearing.

- April 5, 2021 Temporary PFA Order (CI-21-02064, authorized by Judge Merrill Spahn Jr.): Issued without probable cause after my ex-wife, Alene Reich, filed a complaint six days post my initial affidavit challenging her actions. It granted her temporary custody despite no prior abuse concerns in our 20-year relationship.
- April 28, 2021 PFA Filed by Me (CI-21-02608): Dismissed/vacated on May 26, 2021, without a full hearing, while her reciprocal PFA was briefly entertained.
- May 25, 2021 Dismissal of Her PFA (by Judge Craig Stedman): Acknowledged lack of merit, but the interim harm—separation from my children—went unremedied.

LEX-CIVIX Analysis: A Treasonous Assault on Divine and Legal Order

These PFA orders represent a profane abomination, fracturing the sacred family unit ordained by God and trampling unalienable rights through corrupt cartel machinations. Applying LEX-CIVIX vertically exposes them as void ab initio, binding the court to vacatur while accruing \$500–\$1,500/min per child in liability since my un rebutted April 15, 2021 Notice—now exceeding billions—with enforcement via commercial liens or common law courts.

- **Biblical Preamble: Divine Mandates Violated** These ex parte abominations pervert God's command for justice without partiality (Deuteronomy 16:18-20: "Follow justice and justice alone"), oppressing the innocent father and fatherless children (Exodus 22:22-24: "My wrath will burn"), and dishonoring parental authority (Ephesians 6:4: "Fathers... bring them up in the discipline of the Lord"). The timed filing with school custody demands mocks Proverbs 17:15 ("He who condemns the righteous is an abomination"), inviting divine curses for separating heritage from the Lord (Psalm 127:3-5). This defiance of Federal Public Law 97-280 (affirming Biblical teachings as foundational to U.S. law) demands righteous vacatur to avert eternal judgment (Hebrews 10:31: "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God").
- **Core Foundational Frameworks: Constitutional, USC, CFR, Case Law, Court Rules Shredded****Constitution:** Egregious breach of 14th Amendment Due Process (no pre-order hearing, violating procedural safeguards per Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319 (1976)) and Substantive Due Process (arbitrary custody seizure without compelling interest, defying Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57 (2000)), Equal Protection (gender-biased favoritism, per Doe v. Purdue University, 928 F.3d 652 (7th Cir. 2019)), and Supremacy Clause (overriding federal parental protections, per Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1 (1958)). This treasonous overreach usurps divine parental roles, void under Article VI. **USC:** Willful violation of 42 U.S.C. § 666 (mandating hearings before custody-linked enforcements), § 654 (state plans requiring due process), and § 1983 (depriving rights under color of law, basis for suit per Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs., 436 U.S. 658 (1978)). These PFA weapons pervert Title IV-D's welfare recovery intent (Public Law 93-647) into parental kidnapping tools. **CFR:** Flagrant disregard for 45 CFR § 303.101 (expedited processes with notice) and § 303.100 (advance notice for deprivations), exposing funding fraud patterns under § 304.20—post-Loper Bright (602 U.S. ____ (2024)), no agency deference shields this corruption. **Case Law:** Defies Stanley v. Illinois (405 U.S. 645 (1972)) (fitness hearings required) and Santosky v.

Kramer (455 U.S. 745 (1982)) (clear evidence for deprivations), rendering ex parte orders void per United States v. Throckmorton (98 U.S. 61 (1878)). **Court Rules:** Misapplies Pa.R.C.P. 1901.3 (requiring probable cause for PFAs) and FRCP 65 (TROs demand irreparable harm showings), violating procedural fairness per Haines v. Kerner (404 U.S. 519 (1972)) for pro se liberal construction.

- **Secondary Frameworks: UCC/Commercial, State Parallels, Facts and Circumstances Exposed****UCC/Commercial:** These orders breach UCC § 1-308 (performance with reservation of rights) and § 3-501 (presentment demands), as PFAs function as commercial instruments in Title IV-D schemes—contractual failures under cooperative agreements expose to penalties (no rebuttal to my April 2021 notice constitutes acceptance). **State Framework:** Parallels federal violations in Pa. Const. Art. I, § 11 (open courts), 23 Pa.C.S. § 5328 (best interest factors require evidence), Pa. Code Regs. (e.g., 55 Pa. Code § 3140.21 for due process in family services), state case law (e.g., In re Marriage of Mitchell (Ill. Sup. Ct. 1998) for circumstances consideration), and local rules (Pa.R.C.P. 1901 for PFA procedures)—all ignored in this cartel collusion. **Facts and Circumstances (Timeline):** The April 5 order timed suspiciously with school custody demands (April 2 Waldorf statement), post my March 28 affidavit, reveals premeditated fraud (emails show collusion); no prior abuse in 20 years, yet ex parte grant separated me from children—pattern of theft since March 28, 2021, accruing fines.
- **Remedy Framework: Demand for Righteous Justice** Immediate vacatur of all PFA orders, cease and desist enforcement, personal liability at \$100,000 per trespass plus \$500–\$1,500/min per child, federal escalation via §1983 suits, RICO claims, DOJ referrals, and HHS audits. Proposed Order: Restore status quo custody, award compensatory damages, sanction actors, and certify constitutional questions.

Custody Orders Custody determinations

Meant to prioritize child welfare, devolved into rubber-stamped deprivations of my parental rights, often via interim orders that became de facto permanent without trial.

- June 17/18, 2021 Custody Order (CI-21-02607, signed by Judge Christopher Hackman): Granted 100% legal custody to Alene Reich under misapplied Rule 236 (requiring defendant confession and warrant of attorney, neither present as I was plaintiff). Preemptively known by her via emails, suggesting collusion.
- June 16, 2025 Interim Custody Order (by Senior Judge William P. Mahon): Maintained mother's custody pending hearing; repeated in variations like December 20, 2023, and September 25, 2024 (adding agreements without my full consent).
- October 9, 2025 Final Custody Order (by Judge Mahon): Awarded full legal/physical custody to mother, denying my motions for recusal and reconsideration (e.g., August 27, 2025 denial).
- Other Interims/Denials: June 23, 2025 order for final conference; December 16, 2024 amended order for therapy; multiple denials of motions to strike/recuse (e.g., July 23, 2025; November 22, 2024).

LEX-CIVIX Analysis: A Blasphemous Kidnapping Under Cartel Guise

These custody orders are a satanic heresy, ripping apart God's holy family design through ex parte collusion and rubber-stamping, accruing \$500–\$1,500/min per child in liability since my March/April 2021 notices—now in the billions—with tacit acceptance binding enforcement via liens.

- **Biblical Preamble: Divine Mandates Violated** Profane severance of parental bonds defies Ephesians 6:4 (fathers nurture children in the Lord) and Genesis 2:24 (one-flesh unity extends to offspring), oppressing the fatherless (Exodus 22:22-24, wrath burns) and perverting justice (Deuteronomy 16:18-20). This abomination condemns the righteous (Proverbs 17:15), inviting curses (Deuteronomy 28:15-68) for idolatry of state over God (1 Samuel 8:10-18). Under Public Law 97-280, this demands vacatur to restore divine order.
- **Core Foundational Frameworks: Constitutional, USC, CFR, Case Law, Court Rules Shredded****Constitution:** Treasonous breach of 14th Amendment Due Process (no evidentiary hearing, violating Mathews v. Eldridge) and Substantive Due Process (bias ignores fitness, per Troxel v. Granville), Equal Protection (mother favored, per Doe v. Purdue), Supremacy Clause (overrides federal protections, per Cooper v. Aaron), and 1st Amendment Petition Clause (denied recusal motions, per Bounds v. Smith). **USC:** Defies 42 U.S.C. § 666 (hearings required), § 654 (due process in plans), § 1983 (rights deprivation, per Monell), and § 1738B (full faith and credit lacks process). **CFR:** Ignores 45 CFR § 303.101 (expedited processes), § 303.8 (reviews), exposing fraud under § 304.20—post-Loper, no deference. **Case Law:** Violates Stanley v. Illinois (fitness hearings), Santosky v. Kramer (clear evidence), and Throckmorton (fraud voids). **Court Rules:** Misapplies Pa.R.C.P. 236 (no confession), FRCP 60(b) (void for fraud), violating pro se rights per Haines v. Kerner.
- **Secondary Frameworks: UCC/Commercial, State Parallels, Facts and Circumstances Exposed****UCC/Commercial:** Breaches UCC § 1-308 (reservation of rights ignored) and § 3-501 (presentment for custody "contracts"), as Title IV-D agreements are commercial—unrebutted notices accept liability. **State Framework:** Mirrors violations in Pa. Const. Art. I § 11 (open courts), 23 Pa.C.S. § 5328 (evidence for factors), Pa. Code Regs. (55 Pa. Code § 3140.21 for process), state case law (In re Marriage of Mitchell), and local rules (Pa.R.C.P. 1915.10). **Facts and Circumstances (Timeline):** June 2021 order preempted by emails (collusion June 11-14), converting conference to hearing without notice; ongoing deprivations since April 2021 timeline show pattern of theft.

Child Support and Financial Enforcement Orders Support orders,

Intended as equitable obligations, morphed into punitive asset grabs, based on flawed income calculations and leading to seizures without remedy.

- May 3, 2021 Recommended Support Order (ratified June 25, 2021): Set initial obligations; modified repeatedly (e.g., April 11, 2024 unallocated order at \$2,806.82/month plus arrears).
- November 25, 2024 Final Support Order (by Judge Mahon): Denied modifications, adopting April 16, 2024 interim as final despite unverified income.
- Asset Freeze/Seize Orders (Multiple in 2025): January 10/17, 2025 freezes on Digital Federal Credit Union/Northwest Bank accounts; February 13, 2025 seizures up to \$38,349.46 arrears; October 2, 2025 additional seizure.
- Other Enforcement: March 18, 2024 contempt order; September 26, 2022 interim; August 30, 2021 bench warrant for non-appearance.

LEX-CIVIX Analysis: A Racketeering Theft Masquerading as Justice

These support and seizure orders are a demonic extortion racket, stealing fruits of labor against God's prohibition on theft (Exodus 20:15), accruing billions in fines since 2021 notices with tacit acceptance.

- **Biblical Preamble: Divine Mandates Violated** Confiscatory grabs pervert Proverbs 31:27 (diligent household oversight) and Ezekiel 18:8 (no unfair gain), oppressing the provider (Isaiah 10:1-2) and inviting curses for unjust decrees (Deuteronomy 28:15). Under Public Law 97-280, this demands vacatur to restore divine provision.
- **Core Foundational Frameworks: Constitutional, USC, CFR, Case Law, Court Rules Shredded****Constitution:** Violates 5th Amendment Takings (uncompensated seizures, per *Boddie v. Connecticut*) and 14th Due Process (manipulated income without evidence, per *Mathews*), Equal Protection (ignores shared claims), Supremacy Clause (defies federal standards). **USC:** Breaches 42 U.S.C. § 666 (hearings for modifications), § 654 (fair plans), § 1983 (deprivations), § 1738B (process lacking). **CFR:** Defies 45 CFR § 303.8 (reviews), § 303.101 (notice), exposing fraud under § 304.20. **Case Law:** Ignores *Stanley* (fitness), *Throckmorton* (fraud voids), *Monell* (patterns). **Court Rules:** Misuses Pa.R.C.P. equivalents for enforcement without hearings, violating FRCP 60(b).
- **Secondary Frameworks: UCC/Commercial, State Parallels, Facts and Circumstances Exposed****UCC/Commercial:** Violates UCC § 3-501 (presentment for debts), as support is commercial under Title IV-D—unrebutted notices bind liability. **State Framework:** Parallels in Pa. Const. Art. I § 11, 23 Pa.C.S. § 4321 (fair support), regs (55 Pa. Code § 3140.21), case law (*In re Marriage of Mitchell*), rules (Pa.R.C.P. 1910.16-1). **Facts and Circumstances (Timeline):** May 2021 order ignored unverified income; ongoing seizures since 2021 timeline show extortion pattern.
- **Remedy Framework: Demand for Righteous Justice** Immediate vacatur, cease seizures, refund arrears, \$100,000 per trespass plus per-minute fines, §1983/RICO suits, audits. Proposed Order: Nullify obligations, award restitution, sanction, certify questions.

In summary, this partial catalog of over two dozen orders—from PFAs in 2021 to 2025 custodies and seizures—reveals a concerted failure of the legal system. Each grouping perpetuates

violations of due process, equal protection, and neutral adjudication, often through ex parte actions, rule misapplications, and ignored filings. Cumulatively, they build an irrefutable record: since my unrebutted Notice of Liability (April 15, 2021) and Affidavit (June 23, 2021), the court's persistence without counter-affidavit constitutes tacit approval of my terms. Fines now exceed billions (adjusted per Trezevant v. City of Tampa precedents), enforceable via liens or common law courts. This is not justice; it's convoluted Federal supremacy.

A SAMPLING OF NOTICES, ORDERS AND MISCILANEOUS FILES

The following is a Sampling of Notices, Orders, and miscellaneous files. Please note the very last pages of the material for the “Convolutd Federal Supremacy” quotation.

Full state dockets can be found here:

CI-2021-0333, PACSES 96730073,
CI-21-02607,
CI-20-06144,
CI-21-02608,
CI-21-04010,
CI-21-02064
CI-25-00735

:Blair-Jesse-Ellyn: Reich
:~227-Cherry-Street
:~Columbia, ~Pennsylvania
:~979-574-1577

Wrongdoers:

OFFICE OF COURT ADMINISTRATION - SCHEDULING SECTION, a corporate fiction, PO BOX 83480 LANCASTER, PA 17608

:Daniel: Scarberry, a man, BAIL ADMINISTRATION, a corporate fiction, 50 NORTH DUKE STREET, LANCASTER PA 17602

:Chris: Leppler, a man, LANCASTER COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE, a corporate fiction, 50 NORTH DUKE STREET, LANCASTER PA 17608

:Joshua: Parson, a man; :Ray: D'Agostino, a man; :Craig: Lehman a man; LANCASTER COUNTY COURTHOUSE, a corporate fiction, 50 NORTH DUKE STREET, LANCASTER, PA 17602

:Heather: Adams, a woman, OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY LANCASTER COUNTY, a corporate fiction, 50 NORTH DUKE STREET, LANCASTER, PA 17608

NOTICE OF LIABILITY AND FEE SCHEDULE

I, a man, :Blair-Jesse-Ellyn: Reich, serve Notice to any man, woman, PERSON, doing business as or acting for a corporation of any type, who believes they possess authority to Administer my Property without my consent, expressed in the form of an obligation [contract] containing my wet ink autograph, that I have personal knowledge of and asseverate the following:

- 1. I, a man, :Blair-Jesse-Ellyn: Reich, claim my body, information, and genetic material, are my Property.*
- 2. I, a man, :Blair-Jesse-Ellyn: Reich, claim my offspring: :Isabella-Marie: Reich, :Evelyn-Josephine: Reich, and :Julius-Fire: Reich; while under the age of consent are my Property.*
- 3. :Alene-Wilmoth: Reich and :Wendy: Chan conspired to take my property after I countersued in a divorce. My property has been held since March 28th, 2021. :Alene-Wilmoth: Reich was sent an Affidavit of Custody. It went un rebutted. I served a Notice of Default. I testified to this on April 7th without a single objection. :Alene-Wilmoth: Reich is unlawfully holding my property. I have terms and conditions that anyone that is involved in this is liable for \$500/min/property if they have a fiduciary responsibility to act and fail, and \$1500/min/property if they willfully aid and abet :Alene-Wilmoth: Reich and :Wendy: Chan in their theft.*

4. *I, a man, :Blair-Jesse-Ellyn: Reich, claim I am the sole responsible party and holder in due course of all my Private Property, including all property gained from the fruits of my labor labor being defined here as "the gains made from my physical or mental exertion."*
5. *I, a man, :Blair-Jesse-Ellyn: Reich, claim :~227 Cherry Street, ~Columbia, ~Pennsylvania, is my Property.*
6. *I, a man, :Blair-Jesse-Ellyn: Reich, claim cryptocurrencies and non-fungible tokens held in my private accounts, shares of privately held corporations, and money in bank accounts administered by me are my Property.*
7. *I, a man, :Blair-Jesse-Ellyn: Reich, claim I am not Property of any man, woman, or PERSON, doing business as, or acting, for any other man, woman, PERSON, or corporation of any type.*
8. *I, a man, :Blair-Jesse-Ellyn: Reich, claim I do not have an obligation [contract] with any man, woman, or PERSON, doing business as, or acting for, a corporation of any type.*
9. *I, a man, :Blair-Jesse-Ellyn: Reich, claim I have not relinquished rights to any man, woman, or PERSON, doing business as, or acting for, a corporation of any type.*
10. *I, a man, :Blair-Jesse-Ellyn: Reich, claim I have no obligation [contract] to acknowledge, believe, or adhere to laws, statutes, ordinances, codes, et. al, authored by other men, women, PERSONS, doing business as, or acting for, a corporation of any type.*
11. *The fine for each incident of Trespass and Administration of my [:Blair-Jesse-Ellyn: Reich] Property without right is \$100,000.00 per man and woman involved.*
12. *The fine for each utterance of a forged document against I, a man, :Blair-Jesse-Ellyn: Reich, is \$100,000.00 per man and woman involved.*
13. *I am the responsible party and owner in due course of my property. Anyone that is involved in continued armed theft, robbery, and kidnapping of my property is liable for \$500/min/property if they have a fiduciary responsibility to act and fail, and \$1500/min/property if they willfully aided and abetted :Alene-Wilmoth: Reich and :Wendy: Chan in their theft.*
14. *The fine for unlawful arrest of me is \$500/min and \$2000/min if you cause my body any physical damage during an unlawful arrest.*
15. *Any man, woman, or PERSON acting on behalf of a MUNICIPAL CORPORATION that commits any type of battery against my body or my property will be issued a fine for \$2,000,000.00 for each individual occurrence.*
16. *Fines may be enforced through the Commercial Lien process against each man and woman in their individual capacity.*
17. *Fines may be enforced through a formal Judicial process in a Court of Record, with all the qualities and incidents of a Court of Record at Common Law.*
18. *Any Attorney that involves themselves in any matter involving I, a man, :Blair-Jesse-Ellyn: Reich, and my Property, will not only be B.A.R. Grieved, but will be served Affidavits and Notice of Claim for Trespassing and Administering Property without right, and for uttering forged documents, in the amount of \$200,000.00 for each incident.*
19. *Any attorney that involves themselves in any matter involving I, a man, :Blair-Jesse-Ellyn: Reich, will have State and Federal criminal complaints filed against them.*
20. *This Notice is enforceable from the day of its receipt by the Wrongdoer.*

I declare and will testify viva voce, in open court, under penalty of perjury that all herein be true. Executed on this 15th day, of April, in the year of our Lord, two-thousand-and-twenty-one.

I, a man, unrepresented, a living soul, in the flesh and blood as myself, a live-life-claimant,
:Blair-Jesse-Ellyn: Reich

Reich, Blair Jesse Ellyn
% 227 Cherry Street
Columbia, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania

Respondent Litigants:

Alene Reich, Wendy Chan, Kristin Jaquis

Respondent Judges at the COURT OF COMMON PLEAS LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA:

David L. Ashworth, David R. Workman, Dennis E. Reinaker, Donald R. Totaro, Howard F. Knisely, Jeffery D. Wright, Margaret Miller, Christopher A. Hackman, Jeffrey J. Reich, Leonard G. Brown, III, Merrill M. Spahn Jr., Thomas B. Sponaugle, Jeffrey A. Conrad, Craig W. Stedman

Respondent Staff COURT OF COMMON PLEAS LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA:

Andrew Spade, Jacquelyn Pfursich, Heather Adams, Christopher Leppler, Daniel Scarberry, Joshua Parson, Ray D'Agostino, Craig Lehman

Respondent DRS:

Gary Kline, PER CURIAM, Team IV

Respondent Custody Conference Official:

Penn Glazier

Respondent (MUNICIPAL) CORPORATIONS:

Chan and Associates

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

Respondent Negligent Fiduciaries:

Amy Dreibelbis, Max Baer, Veronica Degraffenreid, Tom Wolf, Josh Shapiro, Merrick Garland, Jack Brommer, Phoenicia Wallace, Ed Haugh, Robert Evanchick, Dave Hickernell, John Gordner, Lloyd Smucker, Pat Toomey, Bob Casey Jr.

Respondent Negligent Fiduciaries at the JUDICIAL CONDUCT BOARD OF PENNSYLVANIA:

William Wenner, Nancy Clemens, James McCloskey, Patricia Jenkins, Renee Jubelirer, Andrew Masich, Joseph Brown, Mandi Culhand, Thomas Elliott, Wayne Evans, Celeste Trusty, Nina Padilla

AFFIDAVIT OF LIABILITY AND CLAIM

Background

1. On March 28th, 2018 Alene Reich walked out of the Post Office after reading my first affidavit, went to the Susquehanna Waldorf School, removed our daughters who were in attendance that day, and I haven't had possession of them or my son since.
2. After voicing my concerns about the stability of my offspring's living circumstances and educational prospects whereby whoever picked up the girls first had custody, the Susquehanna Waldorf school issued a statement on April 2nd, 2021 that Reich and I would need to have a custody agreement in place for our daughters to continue going to school.
3. On April 5th Reich filed a Protection from Abuse Complaint and the Order was authorized without probable cause by Merrill Spah Jr. that day.

4. You'll note Reich didn't have a Protection from Abuse concerns for 20 years of our relationship, nor for six days after receiving the first Affidavit I wrote, but once the Waldorf school issued the custody requirement then she filed an action which granted her temporary custody.
5. This indicates that her concerns regarding custody, protection from abuse, and her actions and concerns generally from March 28th through the present have been about control and not about safety; calling her actions against me into question.
6. On April 28th, 2021, I sued for custody.
7. On May 25th, the Protection from Abuse Order was dismissed by Craig Stedman.

Custody Malfeasance

8. On June 3rd, the Custody Conference was held with Penn Glazier.
9. On June 11th, Alene wrote in an email "As I understand it, the temporary order is effective immediately and we will receive it in paper copy this week."
10. On June 14th, Alene wrote in a second email "[Our second daughter] needs to get back in to care- may we have the first available appointment after June 20? I anticipate having the paperwork at that point demonstrating that I have 100% legal custody. Jesse will have access to health records.
11. On June 17th the Custody Order was signed and on June 18th it was issued. The order provided 100% legal custody to Alene Reich and granted me access to health records.
12. The Custody Order was issued pursuant to Rule 236, which requires a Defendant to sign a Confession of Judgement, which requires a Warrant of Attorney.
13. 236 was knowingly misapplied as a deliberate act by Judge Christopher Hackman as I was the Plaintiff (not the defendant), did not confess, and did not supply a warrant of attorney.
14. This order was processed by the Prothonotary's office. Andrew Spade is directly culpable for allowing this unlawful order to be processed under his watch.
15. On June 20th, I wrote an email to Reich, Chan, and Jaquis and questioned how Reich knew exactly what the order would state, 4 days (it's actually 7 days) in advance of the order being published. In this email, I suggested that unlawful collusion had occurred between Christopher Hackman, Penn Glazier, Wendy Chan, Kristin Jaquis, and Alene Reich.
16. On June 20th, Chan wrote back with threats, a tacit admission of guilt.
17. I have sent two sets of Private Criminal Complaints to many people--those who are responsible for these crimes and the fiduciaries who are accountable and negligent while protecting my rights and property--and I have started filing the complaints into my current cases as well.
18. My recent filings are no longer appearing on the record within 24 hours of me filing them into the court records. This evidences obstruction.

Damages

19. April 5th, 2021 I sent notice to responsible parties and fiduciaries indicating fraud by judges and clerks and additional crimes by Reich and Chan.
20. I also forwarded my concerns at the time to THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA.
21. I gave notice to anyone who was facilitating the theft of my offspring that I would be billing them at \$500 a minute for every minute of time that they kept me from my daughters and my son. This amount increased to \$1500 a minute if their involvement was malicious, as opposed to simply negligent.
22. I sent the April 5th letter to Alene Reich, Wendy Chan, Domestic Relations Section, Andrew Spade, Heather Adams, Michael Driscoll, Amy Dreibelbis, Max Baer, Phoenicia Wallace, Veronica Degraffenreid, Tom Wolf, Josh Shapiro, Merrick Garland, Jack Brommer, Ed Haugh, Robert

Evanchick, Dave Hicernell, John Gordner, Lloyd Smucker, Pat Toomey, Bob Casey Jr, and Gary Kline.

23. As a respondent on this AFFIDAVIT OF LIABILITY AND CLAIM, you are directly culpable or negligent, and you are responsible for damages. I am giving you notice of such.
24. Recently, my research brought to light the Trezevant v. City of Tampa case from 1994, which granted an amount of \$1,086.96/minute for unjust imprisonment.
25. Adjusted for the inflation of nearly 30 years, the Trezevant charge would be \$2,700 per minute today. This becomes ~\$8,100 per minute when tripled for punitive damages, or about \$486,000 per hour. I am giving notice of my updated charges for your actions.
26. My three offspring and I are all unlawfully restrained and it's happening because of the malfeasance of this court, it's officers, it's associates, respondent litigants, and negligent fiduciaries. It's happening because of you.
27. It's happening on your watch because you failed to abide by professional standards and hold your associates to the letter of law and/or you knowingly and intentionally broke the law.
28. For the false imprisonment of four people, the inflation-adjusted Trezevant charges amounts to \$1,944,000 per hour. That's \$46,656,000 per day.
29. As of today it's been 86 days. In today's dollars you owe a bill of **\$4,012,416,000**, and counting, in your private capacity and for your role WHILE ACTING UNDER COLOR OF LAW in our unjust restraint.

Medical Emergency

30. When I was able to access medical records I was able to see that my offspring are not doing well medically and now have medically diagnosable problems that are manifesting and require medical attention.
31. Respondents will be held liable for medical harm that befalls my offspring.

Status

32. I am a man, and one of the People of these United States of America, being a creation of God and domiciled in one of the several States.
33. I am, a living, breathing, sentient being on the land, a Natural creation of God, with blood flowing through my body, and therefore am not and cannot be any ARTIFICIAL PERSON.
34. In these United States of America, the authority of any and all governments resides in the People of the land, for government is a fiction of the mind and can only be created by the People, affected by the People, overseen by the People, for the benefit of the People, and to secure the individual God-given rights of the People.
35. I reserve, claim all, and waive none of my God-given, secured and guaranteed Rights, pursuant to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America as ratified in 1791 with the Articles of the Amendments.
36. Pursuant to the Constitution of the United States of America as ratified in 1791 with the Articles of the Amendments, Article VI paragraph 2, "This Constitution and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, under the authority of the United State, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding".
37. As a matter of their lawful compliance to the referenced Constitution, any of the People, while functioning in any Public capacity, in return for the trust of the People, are granted limited delegated authority by the People, with specific duties delineated in accordance thereof, shall only do so pursuant to a lawfully designated, sworn and subscribed Oath of Office and any and all bonds required thereof.

38. The only court authorized by the referenced Constitution to hear matters of the People is a court that conforms to and functions in accordance with Article III Section 2 of the referenced Constitution in which all Officers of the court abide by their sworn and subscribed oaths of office and support and defend the Rights of the People, and are heard only in "Trial by jury", in accordance with all aspects of due process of law.
39. Pursuant to the supreme Law of the Land and the God-given Rights secured and guaranteed therein, this Constitution is established to ensure the dominion granted by God to all People, on this land, shall endure, and ensure forever that the People on this land be free from any and all slavery, indenturement, tyranny, and oppression under the color of any law, statute, code, policy, procedure, or of any other type.
40. Pursuant to this Constitution, I cannot be compelled, manipulated, extorted, tricked, threatened, placed under duress, or coerced or so affected, under the color of law by any Natural Person, who individually, or in any capacity as, or under, any Artificial Person, agency, entity, officer, or party, into waiving of any of my Rights or to act in contradiction thereof, or to act in opposite of the moral conscience and dominion granted to me by God, nor can I be deprived of any of these Rights, privileges, and immunities except by lawful process in accordance with the Law, without that Natural and/or Artificial Person, in whatever capacity. Anyone using any process, not in accordance with the Constitution, causing injury to me, thereby commits numerous crimes, requiring lawful punishment therefrom.
41. I am not a citizen, resident, subject, taxpayer, et al., of MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS, PRIVATE CORPORATIONS, nor am I property of any Respondent listed above; nor does my physical location or the physical location of my Private Property, create duties and obligations upon me to the foregoing MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS, PRIVATE CORPORATIONS, which are Fictions of Law that cannot make claims against a man and his Private Property.
42. I am the sole responsible party and holder in due course for the Private Property known as 227 Cherry Street, Columbia, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania.
43. I am the legal and lawful property owner and responsible party for my offspring IMR, EJ, and JFR.

Disclaimer

44. I am not an expert in the law however I do know right from wrong. If there is any wo/man damaged by any statements herein, if s/he will inform me by facts I will sincerely make every effort to amend my ways. I hereby and herein reserve the right to amend and make amendments to this document as necessary, in order that the truth may be ascertained and proceedings justly determined. If the parties given notice by means of this document have information that would controvert and overcome this Affidavit, advise me IN WRITTEN AFFIDAVIT FORM within three (3) days from receipt hereof, providing me with your counter-affidavit, proving with particularity by stating all requisite actual evidentiary fact and all requisite actual law, and not merely the ultimate facts or conclusions of law, that this Affidavit Statement is substantially and materially false sufficiently to change materially my status and factual declarations. Your silence stands as consent to, and tacit approval of, the factual declarations herein being established as fact as a matter of law.
45. Upon failure to respond this claim comes immediately due and continues to grow as set forth in Damages 13-18.

Reserving ALL my Natural God-Given Unalienable Rights, Waiving None, Ever.

Pursuant to 28 USC § 1746(1) "...any matter is required or permitted to be supported, evidenced, established, or proved by the sworn declaration, verification, certificate, statement, oath, or affidavit, in

NOTICE OF CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Reich, Blair Jesse Ellyn; have mailed the attached AFFIDAVIT OF LIABILITY AND CLAIM against ALENE WILMOTH REICH, conspirators, and negligent Fiduciaries on June 23rd 2021.

Alene Wilmoth Reich, 128-130 East Market Street, Marietta, PA 17547.

REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER: RE 545 427 764 US

Wendy Chan and Kristin Jaquis, 39 N. Lime Street, Lancaster PA 17608.

REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER: RE 545 427 778 US

Merrill Spahn Jr; David Workman; Craig Steadman; Christopher Hackman; Dennis Reinaker; James Cullen; Leslie Gorbey; David Ashworth; Jay Hoberg; Donald Totaro; Howard Kinsely; Jefferey Wright; Margaret Miller; Leonard Brown III; Andrew Spade; Jaquelyn Pfursich; Heather Adams; Chrisopher Leppler; Daniel Scarberry; Joshua Parson; Ray D'Agostino; Craig Lehman. 50 N. Duke Street, Lancaster PA, 17602;

REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER: RE 545 427 781 US

Gary Kline; Team IV, PER CURIAM, 150 North Queen Street, Lancaster PA 17603,

REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER: RE 545 427 795 US

Josh Shapiro, OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL, 16th Floor, Strawberry Square, Harrisburg, PA 17120. 717-787-5211

REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER: RE 545 427 804 US

Merrick Garland, OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20530

REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER: RE 545 427 818 US

Dave Hickernell, PA State Rep, 236 Locust St, Columbia PA, 717-684-5525.

REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER: RE 545 427 821 US

John Gordner, State Senator, Main Capitol, Room 177, Harrisburg, PA 17120, 717-787-8928.

REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER: RE 545 427 835 US

Lloyd Smucker, US Congressman, 51 South Duke St, suite 201, Lancaster PA 17602, 717-393-0667

REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER: RE 545 427 849 US

Pat Toomey, UNITED STATES SENATOR, 455 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C 20510
Phone (202) 224-4254

REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER: RE 545 427 852 US

Bob Casey, Jr. , US SENATOR, 393 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510, Phone number(202) 224-6324

REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER: RE 545 427 866 US

Veronica Degraffenreid, Acting Secretary of State, 302 North Office Building, 401 North street, Harrisburg, PA 17120

REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER: RE 545 427 870 US

Tom Wolf, Governor of Pennsylvania, Governor, Office of the Governor, 508 Main Capitol Building, Harrisburg, PA 17120

REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER: RE 545 427 883 US

Michael Driscoll, Special Agent in Charge of the FBI Field Office in Philadelphia, William J Green Jr. Building, 600 Arch Street, 8th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19106, :-215-418-4000

REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER: RE 545 427 897 US

Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, DISTRICT III Suite 5800 PO Box 62675
Harrisburg PA 17106

REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER: RE 545 427 906 US

William Wenner, Nancy Clemens, James McCloskey, Patricia Jenkins, Renee Jubelirer, Andrew Masich, Joseph Brown, Mandi Culhane, Thomas Elliott, Wayne Evans, Celeste Trusty, Nina Padilla, Judicial Conduct Board, PO Box 62525, Harrisburg PA 17120.

REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER: RE 545 427 910 US

Chief Ed Haugh, 188 Rock Point Rd, Marietta PA 17547

REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER: RE 545 427 923 US:

Chief Jack Brommer, 308 Locust St, Columbia PA, 17512.

REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER: RE 545 427 937 US

Max Baer, The UNIFIED JUDICIAL SYSTEM OF PENNSYLVANIA, 601 Commonwealth Ave, Suite 1500, Harrisburg, PA 17106.

REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER: RE 545 427 945 US

Robert Evanchick, ACTING COMMISSIONER OF THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE, 1800 Elmerton Ave, Harrisburg, PA 17110.

REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER: RE 545 427 954 US

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing was provided by registered mail to the addresses above.

Pursuant to 28 USC § 1746 (1)

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this twenty-third day, of the sixth month, in the year two-thousand-and-twenty-one.

.....
Reich, Blair Jesse Ellyn, Affiant

To: COURT OF COMMON PLEAS LANCASTER PENNSYLVANIA
Office of the Clerk, Clerk of Courts, Pfursich, Jaquelyn RE 545 427 367 US
Office of the Prothonotary, Space, Andrew RE 545 427 353 US
Steadman, Craig RE 545 427 340 US
Hackman, Christopher RE 545 427 296 US
Glazier, Penn RE 545 427 282 US
50 North Duke Street
Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17602
/
Albert, Scott RE 545 427 305 US
424 South Angle Street
Mount Joy, PA 17552
/
Shapiro, Josh RE 545 427 319 US
Pennsylvania Office of Attorney General
Strawberry Square
Harrisburg, PA 17120
/
Jaquis, Kristen RE 545 427 336 US
39 North Lime Street
Lancaster PA 17608

May 18, 2021

From: The Office of General Executor for the
BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, Estate
c/o Post Road: 227 Cherry Street
Columbia, Pennsylvania [17512]

Service of Process: Registered Mail No.: See Numbers Above

Re: BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, Estate, THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
CITY OF WORCESTER, OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, REGISTERED NUMBER 3041 and
the following court cases hereinafter "The Cases":

/
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS LANCASTER COUNTY PENNSYLVANIA -
Case Number CI-20-06144 - Action in Divorce
Docket Number- 2021-0333 and PACSES Case Number 967300735- Complaint for Support
Case Number CI-21-02064 - TEMPORARY PROTECTION FROM ABUSE ORDER
Case Number CI-21-02608 - TEMPORARY PROTECTION FROM ABUSE ORDER
Docket NO. CI-21-02607 - COMPLAINT FOR CUSTODY

/
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, COUNTY OF LANCASTER, District Court-
Docket No MJ-02301-NT-0000093-2021 Harassment Complaint

NOTICE

Notice is hereby given out of **necessity** to address the status, property and obligations of Blair Jesse Ellyn: House of Reich, aka Reich, Blair Jesse Ellyn, hereinafter "I, me, my, lender/lessor", and BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, CITY OF WORCESTER, OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK REGISTERED NO.: 3041, hereinafter "BJER", found in the attached certified court record. **Your rights, privileges and immunities are affected by this matter.** You have a duty and responsibility to read and provide a response to the entire contents of this notice and attachments, hereinafter together as "this Notice".

Ignorance of the law excuses no one. You must apprise yourself of the facts before proceeding with your claim and/or response to this Notice.

Take further notice that your acquiescence is your statement of truth and tacit agreement with the facts stated in this Notice and will be documented as evidence of non-compliance. If you proceed with your claim without a response or a rebuttal of the facts, you may be held accountable. I reserve the right to pursue all appropriate remedies whether at law and in equity, ministerially, administratively or judicially under local, state, federal, treaty, international law and law of the land in whatever forum deemed appropriate to preserve my interests and the interests of the real estate and tenant/lessee BJER as well as to collect any due fees agreed upon by the acceptance of this notice. Govern yourself accordingly.

I. FOREIGN TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION

Pursuant to the attached certified public record Declaration of Property, Status and Obligation, hereinafter "Declaration", my status is peaceful by nature and foreign to the territorial municipal and military statuses of your offices, organizations and all organs connected to them as the whole body of a foreign sovereignty. Pursuant to your 18 U.S.C. § 112 I am a foreign protected person. Further, pursuant to your 18 U.S.C. § 242 it is a crime for any of your persons to deprive me of any right, privilege or immunity under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation or custom which may carry a prison sentence from any term of years depending on the nature of the crime. 42 U.S.C. 1985(3) provides for a civil action for any deprivation of rights by two or more persons, and 42 U.S.C 1983 allows for an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress for deprivation of rights under color of law. Your person, offices and municipal corporations are hereby notified through your agency to cease and desist all actions against me, Reich, Blair Jesse Ellyn a living man, General Executor/C.E.O. and lender/lessor of BJER without your certification of a legal right to do so.

II. ADVERSE CLAIM

Your actions are negatively affecting my interest rights. Pursuant to paragraph 54 and Exhibits C and D of the attached Declaration as well as UCC § 8-105 and/or your state uniform code equivalent, your office is administrating the financial assets of Reich, Blair Jesse Ellyn without authority. As the lender/lessor, I have a right to recover any property and damages negatively affected by your actions. Be advised, it is a violation of the lender/lessor's first priority rights to hold, transfer or deal with the financial assets and other property of BJER, the tenant, and you must cease and desist immediately.

III. FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT AND ENTITLEMENT ORDER

The Office of General Executor/CEO, Reich, Blair Jesse Ellyn, lender/lessor for the individual organization of BJER, hereby appoints the COURT OF COMMON PLEAS LANCASTER COUNTY PENNSYLVANIA Clerk of Courts; Pforshich, Jacquelyn; and Prothonotary, Spade, Andrew as fiduciaries, hereinafter "Fiduciaries", custodian of the BJER estate to settle any claims by any party having a valid certified contract and claim against said tenant/lessee. For other courts the Clerk of Courts of that Court is similarly appointed as fiduciary and hereinafter "Fiduciaries."

As the lender/lessor first priority interest holder, any instruments including but not limited to violation tickets, tax bills, warrants, bonds, certified claims and others, shall be accepted and returned for value in accordance with commercial rights found in U.C.C. § 3-303, and its state uniform equivalent. Said instruments are to be deposited into the appropriate depository account for redemption and/or set-off by the Fiduciary. The Fiduciary is further ordered to balance and settle the books of The Cases, and remove The Cases from the docket. After completing all transactions to settle the matter, the Fiduciary is to provide an accounting to the lender/lessor. If the Fiduciary refuses to perform, s/he shall immediately notify the General Executor of BJER of the non-statutory and statutory authorities for their action.

IV. RIGHT OF SUBROGATION

Pursuant to the attached Declaration and the law of equity, I reserve the right of subrogation to any claim paid out on behalf of BJER by any assumed fiduciary not expressly appointed by me. The right of subrogation includes the recovery of all securities, bonds, warrants, derivatives, proceeds, accounts, funds and other property used to satisfy any claim against BJER. Further, it is demanded the Fiduciary release any real or personal **private** property of Reich, Blair Jesse Ellyn, the lender/lessor of BJER, held in custody of The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and/or the United States and/or the United States of America their offices, officers, agencies, agents, associations, corporations, contractors both public and private and any organizations connected to them that may have seized property in the action of any claim. Return of the property is demanded within (3) days of receipt of this notice. If the private property is not returned, I reserve the right to relief for trespass, theft, unlawful seizure and all other civil and criminal remedies for other violations.

V. BONDS, SECURITIES & TAXES

Capital gains from any bonds and other securities in the name of BJER held in the courts of The Cases as intermediary accounts, or other connected intermediary accounts, shall be paid in a draft indorsed in blank issued to me upon sale or maturity of the security. Before a draft is made, the Fiduciary appointed in section III herein is to comply with all capital gains and other income tax laws applicable to securities and shall further receive all future notices on the individual organization's behalf for any and all tax matters related to securities held in such intermediary accounts. The Fiduciary shall certify all tax matters on behalf of the BJER individual organization.

VI. CEASE AND DESIST; WITHDRAW OF CLAIM; REVOCATION & RELEASE OF GUARDIANSHIP

After receipt and discharge/set-off of any charging instrument, returned for value for collection, identified as tickets/summons/indictments from The Cases, your offices, principals, agents and administrators must cease and desist all further efforts to charge and/or collect on obligations of the BJER Estate and **withdraw your claim and/or prosecution immediately for mistake or discharge**. It is further ordered to cease and desist all attempts to force underwriting charges against BJER on me. It is my intent to correct state and federal records to reflect my proper status, obligations and property in relation to that of BJER for proper estate administration as demonstrated and established by the attached public record Declaration of Status, Property and Obligation.

You are hereby noticed it is unlawful for you to retain my private property, including but not limited to my offspring, and the property of BJER, without a valid contract and agreement between the parties. All real and personal property belongs to the BJER Estate and me as the lender. Up to this point in time, the state has assumed a fiduciary position as guardian over the estates of BJER and the products of BJER, such as the estates of my offspring known as children. The State's assumed guardianship authority over me and my children is hereby revoked pursuant to the attached Power of Attorney and Declaration unless expressly appointed in section III above. I hereby release and hold harmless the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the United States, and the Social Security Administration, from guardianship over BJER and the estates of my offspring. All property, including but not limited to my offspring, any financial accounts, chattels, goods, real property including land and fixtures, personal property such as computers, copiers, printers, files, papers, household items, phones, notebooks, motor conveyances, tools, household items, jewelry and any other real and personal property not stated are to be returned to me immediately as the living Father, lender, lessor and general executor first priority interest holder of the BJER Estate.

VII. TRESPASS; CRIMINAL ACTIONS

After receipt of this notice, the recipient has the duty to research all the facts and law pertaining to this matter. Any action taken by the recipient, their agents, administrators and assigns, which adversely affects my God given rights of Life, Liberty and pursuit of Happiness without a power of attorney to administrate BJER and the property, accounts and estate of the BJER individual organization, is acting under **color of law** and does so at their own peril. This is notice of trespass on private property and deprivation of my substantive rights by your actions. I reserve the right to file criminal complaints and charges for prosecution against any person, man or woman, trespassing on my property or depriving me of my substantive rights through the use of a judicial process under an assumed right.

VIII. FEE SCHEDULE

For any business in which I am to administrate as fiduciary for the individual organization of BJER, the following fees shall apply and be billed per occurrence to the organization or office of the person for whom is soliciting my services on behalf of BJER:

Administrative Fees:

Any Trustee or Fiduciary employed for the matter of processing this claim shall be entitled to 5% of first \$1,000,000.00, 4% of next \$500,000.00, 2% over \$2,000,000.00.

Use of trade name violation:

- 1. Usage of BLAIR J REICHTM; BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH; including, Blair J Reich; BLAIR J REICH; Blair Reich, BLAIR REICH; Reich, Blair J; REICH, BLIAR JESSE; Reich, Blair J; REICH, BLAIR J; Jesse Reich; JESSE REICH; and all derivatives, spellings, and upper-case lower-case combinations and renderings of the trademark and trade name without express written consent \$1,000,000.00

/

Depositions, interrogation (unsolicited):

- 2. Name \$500,000.00
- 3. Address \$500,000.00
- 4. Driver's License Number \$50,000.00
- 5. Social Security Number \$50,000.00
- 6. Retinal Scans \$5,000,000.00
- 7. Fingerprinting \$200,000.00
- 8. Photographing \$200,000.00

/

Acceptance of presentments (without contract):

/

- 9. Unauthorized Citations \$60,000.00
- 10. Warnings Issued on Paper \$25,000.00
- 11. Summons, Court Notices (without contract) \$10,000.00
- 12. All other related items, fees, or offers \$10,000.00

/

DNA or body fluids:

/

- 13. DNA \$5,000,000.00
- 14. Mouth Swabs \$1,000,000.00
- 15. Blood samples \$1,000,000.00
- 16. Urine samples \$1,000,000.00
- 17. Breathalyzer testing \$1,000,000.00
- 18. Hair samples \$1,000,000.00
- 19. Skin samples \$1,000,000.00
- 20. Clothing samples \$1,000,000.00
- 21. Forced giving of fluids/samples \$1,000,000.00

Obstruction of movement/travel, property search, trespass, theft, carjacking, interference with commerce:

/

- 22. Interference with movement without contract or emergency (after warning) \$2,000.00/ Minute
- 23. Temporary detention, obstruction, or restraint (without warrant) (after warning) \$2,000.00/ Minute
- 24. Automobile/Vessel/Car search \$1,000,000.00
- 25. Body/Clothing search \$1,000,000.00
- 26. Handcuffing, being tied or otherwise restricted \$1,000,000.00
- 27. Taking/Theft/Deprivation of Property \$10,000.00 per day
- 28. Jailed, Warehousing, Incarceration \$10,000,000.00 per day

/

Legal Vexations

- 29. Agency by estoppel \$50,000.00 per day
- 30. Color of law \$150,000.00 per day

31. Implied color of law	\$150,000.00
32. Criminal coercion	\$500,000.00
33. Criminal contempt of court	\$500,000.00
34. Estoppel by election	\$350,000.00
35. Estoppel by laches	\$350,000.00
36. Equitable estoppel	\$500,000.00
37. Fraud	\$1,000,000.00
38. Fraud upon the court	\$2,000,000.00
39. Larceny	\$250,000.00
40. Grand larceny	\$250,000.00
41. Larceny by extortion	\$1,000,000.00
42. Larceny by trick	\$1,000,000.00
43. Obstruction of justice	\$100,000.00
44. Obtaining property by false pretenses	\$1,000,000.00
45. Simulating legal process	\$10,000,000.00
46. Vexatious litigation	\$5,000,000.00
47. Trespass upon motor conveyance	\$100,000.00
48. Unauthorized relocation of motor conveyance	\$100,000.00
49. Seizure of motor conveyance	\$100,000.00 per day
50. Theft of license plate	\$25,000.00
51. Unlawful lien on motor conveyance	\$50,000.00

/

Use of trade name protected material under threat, duress, and/ or coercion:

52. Name written by the informant	\$250,000.00
53. Drivers License written by informant	\$150,000.00
54. Theft of license plate	\$25,000.00
55. Unlawful lien on motor conveyance	\$50,000.00
56. Social Security Number written by informant	\$150,000.00
57. Miscellaneous Material written by informant	\$500,000.00
58. Financial Information	\$150,000.00

/

Forced production of personal information/property for any kind of business interaction:

59. Property inside of motor vehicle	\$150,000.00
60. Financial Information	\$100,000.00

/

Time Usage for traffic stops:

61. 30 minutes	\$5,000.00/ 30 minutes
----------------	------------------------

/

Demand for Appearance in court:

62. Our appearance under protest and duress	\$75,000.00/hour
63. Our appearance voluntarily	\$10,000.00/hour

/

Use of trade name material

64. Name under protest and duress	\$250,000.00
65. Name voluntarily	\$15,000.00
66. Drivers license under protest and duress	\$250,000.00

67. Drivers license voluntarily	\$15,000.00
68. Social security number under protest and duress	\$250,000.00
69. Social security number voluntarily	\$10,000.00
70. Miscellaneous material	\$25,000.00
71. Produce Financial Information	\$10,000.00
72. Produce Drivers license	\$100,000.00
73. Produce social security	\$250,000.00
74. Any other document produced by us	\$50,000.00

/

Time usage for court appearances:

75. 30 minutes under protest and duress	\$33,500.00
76. 30 minutes Voluntarily	\$10,000.00
77. 60 minutes under protest and duress	\$75,000.00
78. 60 minutes voluntarily	\$20,000.00
79. 90 minutes or more under protest and duress	\$100,000.00
80. 90 minutes voluntarily or more	\$30,000.00

/

Court Appearance Schedule

These fees MUST be paid immediately after my case is finished. Failure to pay fines and fees will have an additional fee of \$5000.00 for breach of contract.

Trespass by public official(s), police officer(s), judge(s), attorney(s), Corporation(s) and other fictional entities as well as all others who desire to contract:

81. Failure to honor God given rights	\$100,000.00
82. Failure to honor Oath of Office	\$50,000.00
83. Failure to honor Constitutional Oath	\$50,000.00
84. Failure to honor Written and/or Oral word	\$5,000.00
85. Silence/Dishonor/Default	\$5,000.00
86. Failure to honor /No Bond	\$5,000.00
87. Phone call to telephone number used by us from "debt" collectors	\$5,000.00
88. Telephone message left on our equipment	\$5,000.00
89. Use of our street address/ mailing location	\$5,000 each
90. Time waiting for scheduled service	\$ 1,000.00 Minimum or per hour
91. Detention from Free Movement and/or cuffed	\$ 75,000.00 Minimum or per hour
92. Incarceration	\$ 75,000.00 Minimum or per hour
93. Failure to follow Federal/State Statutes/Codes/Rules/Regulations	\$ 50,000.00
94. Failure to State a Claim upon which relief Can Be Granted	\$250,000.00
95. Failure to present a living injured party	\$100,000.00
96. Failure to provide contract signed by the parties	\$100,000.00*
97. Default By Non Response or Incomplete Response	\$100,000.00*
98. Fraud	\$1,000,000.00*
99. Racketeering	\$1,000,000.00*
100. Theft of Public Funds	\$1,000,000.00*
101. Dishonor in Commerce	\$1,000,000.00*
102. Failure to pay Counterclaim in full within (30) Thirty Days of Default	\$1,000,000.00**
103. Perverting of Justice Judgment	\$1,000,000.00*
104. Use of Common-law Trade-name/Trade-mark	\$50,000.00 Each
105. Forcing psychiatric evaluations	\$500,000.00 per day

- 106. Refusal to provide adequate and proper nutrition while incarcerated \$500,000.00 per day
- 107. Refusal to provide proper exercise while incarcerated \$ 50,000.00 per day
- 108. Refusal to provide proper dental care while Incarcerated \$ 500,000.00 per day
- 109. Forced giving of body fluids \$ 5,000,000.00 each
- 110. Forced injections/inoculations, vaccines \$ 5,000,000.00 each
- 111. Forced separation from marriage contract \$10,000,000.00
- 112. Confiscation/kidnapping/theft of non US Citizens (me, wife, and/or offspring) \$1,600,000 per day
- 113. Corporate State continuing a mortgage for more than five years in violation of Banking Act of 1864 which takes precedence over current statutes at large \$ 1,600,000 per day
- 114. Attempted extortion of funds from birth certificate account, Social security account or any other associated accounts by fraud, deception and or Forgery by any agent, entity or corporation \$6,000,000 per charge
- 115. Attempted extortion of signature \$6,000,000 per charge
- 116. Attempted forgery of signature \$6,000,000 per charge

/

*Per Occurrence and Includes any Third Party Defendant

** All claims are stated in US Dollars which means that a US Dollar will be defined, for this purpose as a One Ounce Silver Coin of .999 pure silver or the equivalent par value as established by law or the exchange rate, as set by the US Mint, whichever is the higher amount, for a certified One Ounce Silver Coin (US Silver Dollar) at the time of the first day of default as set forth herein; if the claim is to be paid in Federal Reserve Notes, Federal Reserve Notes will only be assessed at Par Value as indicated above.

Total damages will be assessed as the total amount of the damages as set forth herein times three (3) for a total of all damages as set forth in subsections 1-114 added to three (3) times the damages for punitive or other additional damages.

Time usage for court appearances:

- 117. Studying / analyzing / research / document preparation, answering questions, providing information \$500.00/hour
- 118. Activities of 114 while under threat or duress \$75,000.00/hour

/

Signature, endorsement, autograph (SEA):


- 119. Autograph, signature, seal, or endorsement under threat or duress \$1,000,000.00

/

If invoiced, payment is due 15 days after receipt date.

Make all payments to:

Reich, Blair Jesse Ellyn
 c/o 227 Cherry Street
 Columbia, PA 17512

By:  (seal)
 Reich, Blair Jesse Ellyn
 Creditor, Beneficiary and General Executor
 For the BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, Estate

Certificate of service by asseveration

I, Blair Jesse Elyyn: House of Reich, affirm under the laws of God, we did place a Notice of Adverse Claim (8 pages) in an envelope, sealed the envelope and mailed the documents by placing them in custody of the Postmaster of the United States Post Office by registered mail to the below recipients this eighteenth day of May two thousand twenty-one *anno domini*.

To: COURT OF COMMON PLEAS LANCASTER PENNSYLVANIA
Office of the Clerk, Clerk of Courts, Pfursich, Jaquelyn RE 545 427 367 US
Office of the Prothonotary, Space, Andrew RE 545 427 353 US
Steadman, Craig RE 545 427 340 US
Hackman, Christopher RE 545 427 296 US
Glazier, Penn RE 545 427 282 US
50 North Duke Street
Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17602

/
Albert, Scott RE 545 427 305 US
424 South Angle Street
Mount Joy, PA 17552

/
Shapiro, Josh RE 545 427 319 US
Pennsylvania Office of Attorney General
Strawberry Square
Harrisburg, PA 17120

/
Jaquis, Kristen RE 545 427 336 US
39 North Lime Street
Lancaster PA 17608

By:  (seal)
Blair Jesse Elyyn: House Reich
Creditor, Beneficiary and General Executor
For the BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH,
Estate



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
JUDICIAL CONDUCT BOARD

PENNSYLVANIA JUDICIAL CENTER
601 COMMONWEALTH AVENUE, SUITE 3500
P.O. BOX 62525
HARRISBURG, PA 17106-2525
WWW.JCBPA.ORG

717-234-7911

October 15, 2025

Mr. Blair Reich
227 Cherry Street
Columbia, PA 17512

Re: Judicial Conduct Board File Nos. 2025-013 (Judge Mahon)
2025-014 (Justice Todd)

Dear Mr. Reich:

This letter will acknowledge receipt of your recent correspondences wherein you are requesting reconsideration of previous complaints filed with the Judicial Conduct Board.

The Board reviewed your complaints and all issues you raised and found no basis to proceed. Your request for reconsideration, standing alone, does not provide a basis for reopening or reevaluating your complaints. In the absence of new and different allegations, these matters will not be reconsidered.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Melissa L. Norton".

Melissa L. Norton
Chief Counsel

MLN:cmm

Thomas J. Farrell
Chief Disciplinary Counsel

Raymond S. Wierciszewski
Deputy Chief Disciplinary Counsel

Jana M. Palko
Counsel-in-Charge, Central Intake
Frick Building, Ste. 1300
437 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
(412) 565-3173

THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD
OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA



OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
www.padisciplinaryboard.org

Intake Counsel

Robin B. Godfrey
Elizabeth J. Rubin
1601 Market St., Ste. 3320
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2337
(215) 560-6296

Dana M. Pirone
820 Adams Ave., Ste. 170
Trooper, PA 19403
(610) 650-8210

Anna M. Ciardi
Rebecca K. Leventopoulos
Samuel F. Napoli
Frick Building, Ste. 1300
437 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
(412) 565-3173

May 29, 2025

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Blair Reich
227 Cherry Street
Columbia, PA 17512

Re: Complaint Against David Winslow Sunday, Jr., Esquire
File Reference #C3-25-424

Complaint Against Thomas Ost-Prisco, Esquire
File Reference #C2-25-538

Dear Mr. Reich:

We are in receipt of the complaints you submitted to this office regarding Attorneys David Winslow Sunday, Jr. and Thomas Ost-Prisco. After review of the complaint, our office has determined that the complaint warrants dismissal for the reasons set forth below.

Mr. Sunday is the Pennsylvania Attorney General and Mr. Ost-Prisco is a Senior Deputy Attorney General. In the complaints to this office regarding Mr. Sunday and Mr. Ost-Prisco, you allege, among other things, that they have engaged in "witness intimidation, conspiracy, and treason" against you. You assert that Mr. Sunday and Mr. Ost-Prisco had a threatening letter hand-delivered to your house, wherein they warned you that the Private Criminal Complaints you have submitted to their office are frivolous and may lead to charges being brought against you.

You should recall from previous complaints you have submitted to this office that the Rules of Professional Conduct are limited in scope, and express specific prohibitions in limited areas of what might be called "improper" or "unethical" behavior. An attorney can only be disciplined for conduct that clearly violates a specific Rule. Moreover, this office must assess matters complained of as to whether any potential disciplinary violation is

Blair Reich
May 29, 2025
Page Two

established by clear and convincing evidence. Because we could not substantiate a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct based upon your allegations, we have dismissed the complaints.

As we have informed you multiple times, the vast majority of the Rules of Professional Conduct are with regard to the attorney-client relationship, and the duties that an attorney has to their own client. Neither Mr. Sunday nor Mr. Ost-Prisco owe duties to you as they would to a client. Mr. Sunday and Mr. Ost-Prisco represent the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and not any alleged victims of crimes or other wrongdoing.

Moreover, Mr. Sunday and Mr. Ost-Prisco, through their roles in the Pennsylvania Office of the Attorney General, have the authority to decide whether and which criminal charges to file or pursue, as well as what legal position the office will take regarding any given issue. This broad power is known as prosecutorial discretion. It is not the role or function of this office to review or disturb that discretion—or to substitute our judgment for that of the Office of the Attorney General. We would also note that, generally, allegations regarding the exercise of prosecutorial discretion do not amount to a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

That said, it is your prerogative to consult with counsel of your own choosing regarding your concerns, as counsel can advise you as to any potential rights, remedies, or options you may have available to you to pursue your concerns before the appropriate civil and/or criminal court. This office cannot render to you legal advice nor recommend or appoint counsel.

With few exceptions, the attorney disciplinary system is confidential and remains so unless and until formal disciplinary charges are filed by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel against the respondent-attorney with the Disciplinary Board and the respondent-attorney has had the opportunity to answer those charges.

We appreciate the interest and concern with the legal profession which you showed by bringing this matter to our attention.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Anna Marie Ciardi', written in a cursive style.

Anna Marie Ciardi
Disciplinary Counsel

AMC/rgc



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

MICHELLE A. HENRY
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Criminal Prosecutions Section
16th Floor, Strawberry Square
Harrisburg, PA 17120
June 10, 2024

Dr. Blair Reich
227 Cherry Street
Columbia, Pennsylvania 17512

RE: Private Criminal Complaints
OAG File No: BCC 240206

Dear Dr. Reich:

I have reviewed the Private Criminal Complaints you filed in Lancaster County, naming various elected officials, judges, and the District Attorney as defendants. My records indicate you filed identical Complaint before at least three different Lancaster County District Justices (MDJ 02-1-02, 02-2-03 and 02-3-02). Based on my review I have concluded that the Private Criminal Complaints should be denied. The Private Criminal Complaints contain no legal basis for pursuing a criminal charge against any of the named defendants. Furthermore, the Private Criminal Complaints lack prosecutorial merit.

The District Attorney of Lancaster County has been notified of our decision. This concludes our review of your Private Criminal Complaints. Our office now considers this matter closed.

Sincerely,

/s/ Thomas Ost-Prisco
Thomas Ost-Prisco
Senior Deputy Attorney General
Criminal Prosecutions Section

cc: CPS File
SR-116734-9PNN



United States Department of State

Vermont Passport Agency

44132 Mercure Circle

PO Box 1171

Sterling, Virginia 20166-1171

May 15, 2025

Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich
227 Cherry St
Columbia, PA 17512

RE: 752363959

Dear Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich:

Thank you for your request. The documents you submitted to this office are being returned to you.

If you have any questions please contact the National Passport Information Center: 1-877-487-2778 (TTY/TDD: 1-888-874-7793)

For general passport information, please visit us on-line at travel.state.gov.

Sincerely,

Customer Service Department

Enclosure(s):
Birth Certificate

For assistance:
National Passport Information Center
1-877-487-2778 (TTY/TDD: 1-888-874-7793)

www.travel.state.gov

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

BLAIR JESSE ELLYN; REICH,
Plaintiff,

vs.

DEBRA TODD,
et al.,
Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION - LAW
No. 25-00735

PROTHONOTARY'S OFFICE
LANCASTER, PA

2025 DEC 11 AM 8:38

ENTERED AND FILED

ORDER

And, Now, this 10th day of December, 2025, upon consideration of
Petitioner/Plaintiff Blair Jesse Elynn Reich's *pro se* Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas
Corpus, filed on September 12, 2025; preliminary objections thereto filed by the "County
Defendants"¹ on September 25, 2025, and the "Judicial Defendants"² and Gary Kline in his
official capacity as the Director of the Lancaster County Domestic Relations Office on
September 26, 2025; and Petitioner/Plaintiff's response thereto filed on October 23, 2025; and
for the reasons set forth in the accompanying memorandum opinion filed contemporaneously
with this Order;³

¹ The "County Defendants" are Lancaster County Prothonotary Andrew Spade, District Attorney Heather Adams, Chief County Detective Kent Switzer, Sheriff Christopher Leppler, Commissioner Alice Yoder, Commissioner Joshua Parsons, Commissioner Ray D'Agostino, Director of the Office of Domestic Relations Gary Kline and Solicitor Jacqueline Pfursich.

² The "Judicial Defendants" are Chief Justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court Debra Todd and Common Pleas Judges William P. Mahon, David Ashworth, Merrill Spahn, Jr., Craig Stedman, David Workman, Christopher Hackman, Leonard Brown, III, Dennis E. Reinaker, Jeffrey D. Wright, Margaret C. Miller, Jeffrey J. Reich, Thomas B. Sponaugle, Jeffrey A. Conrad, JoAnne Murphy, Sharn P. McLaughlin, David Totaro, Howard Kinsley, Todd Brown and Christina Parsons.

³ Oral argument on Defendants' preliminary objections was scheduled for 1:30 p.m. on November 18, 2025, at which time David J. MacMain, Esquire, appeared on behalf of the County Defendants and Sonya Kivisto, Legal Counsel, Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts, appeared on behalf of the Judicial Defendants and Mr. Kline in his official capacity. Neither Petitioner/Plaintiff nor anyone on his behalf appeared at that time.

IT IS ORDERED said objections are Granted and Petitioner/Plaintiff's Amended Petition
for Writ of Habeas Corpus is Dismissed with prejudice.

BY THE COURT:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT
UNIVERSITY CITY, PA 19106-0001
12/11/2025



EDWARD D. REIBMAN, Senior Judge
Specially Presiding

Attest:

CC: Mr. Blair Jesse Reich
227 Cherry Street
Columbia, PA 17512

David J. MacMain, Esquire
MacMain Leinhaus
433 W. Market Street, Suite 200
West Chester, PA 19382

Sonya Kivisto, Legal Counsel
Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts
Pennsylvania Judicial Center
601 Commonwealth Avenue
P.O. Box 61260
Harrisburg, PA 17106-1260

Christine Carrigan (copy via electronic mail)
mailed-12/11/2025

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH,
Plaintiff,
vs.
DEBRA TODD,
et al.,
Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION - LAW
No. 25-00735

PROBATION & PAROLE OFFICE
LANCASTER, PA
2025 DEC 11 AM 8:30
ENTERED AND FILED

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before the court are Defendants’ preliminary objections on the bases that Petitioner/Plaintiff Blair Jesse Elyn Reich’s First Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, filed *pro se* on September 12, 2025, is legally insufficient (demurrer) pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. 1028(a)(4) and insufficiently specific pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. 1028 (a)(3).¹ The objections are sustained and the First Amended Petition is dismissed with prejudice.

Petitioner/Plaintiff is a party to a custody action, *Blair Jesse Reich v. Alene Wilmoth Reich*, No. CI 21-02607, and a support action, *Alene W. Reich v. Blair J. Reich*, No. 2021-00333, PACSES No. 967300735, in the Court of Common Pleas of Lancaster County. In this case, Petitioner/Plaintiff claims “various unlawful civil orders arising [in those actions] between March 2021 and present day (1/26/25)” have been in violation of his constitutional and statutory rights resulting in an unlawful restraint or deprivation of his fundamental liberties.² He also claims “any law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania regarding ‘child’ or ‘children’ is void for

¹ Petitioner/Plaintiff commenced the within action by filing *pro se* of a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus on February 3, 2025. A petition for writ of habeas corpus is a civil remedy that tests the legality of detention or imprisonment. Petitioner/Plaintiff does not claim he is detained or imprisoned. His First Amended Petition is in the nature of an amended civil complaint.

² First Amended Petition, at p. 2.

vagueness...”.³ He seeks a declaratory judgment that Defendants have violated his federal and state constitutional rights, a temporary custody order be vacated, a mistrial be entered in the support matter with all funds taken from him be returned to him, the judge assigned to those custody and support matters be enjoined from entering any additional orders, any law pertaining to “child” or “children” be void, and the Court of Common Pleas of Lancaster County undergo training regarding the constitutional rights of litigants, especially in regards to divorce, custody and support cases.

Specifically, Petitioner/Plaintiff’s takes issue with enforcement actions, including forfeiture of funds, in his support case, and a scheduled custody conference he contends was converted *sua sponte* to a hearing after which a temporary order was entered awarding custody of his three children to their mother. The court takes notice that a final order of custody was issued on October 9, 2025.

The amended petition names as defendants the Chief Justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, Debra Todd; the judge assigned to his custody and support cases, Senior Common Pleas Judge William P. Mahon; and Judges of the Court of Common Pleas of Lancaster County David Ashworth, Merrill Spahn, Jr., Craig Stedman, David Workman, Christopher Hackman, Leonard Brown, III, Dennis E. Reinaker, Jeffrey D. Wright, Margaret C. Miller, Jeffrey J. Reich, Thomas B. Sponaugle, Jeffrey A. Conrad, JoAnne Murphy, Sharn P. McLaughlin, David Totaro, Howard Kinsley, Todd Brown and Christina Parsons (together, the “Judicial Defendants”); and Lancaster County Prothonotary Andrew Spade, District Attorney Heather Adams, Chief County Detective Kent Switzer, Sheriff Christopher Leppler, Commissioner Alice Yoder, Commissioner Joshua Parsons, Commissioner Ray D’Agostino, Director of the Office of

³ First Amended Petition at p .8.

Domestic Relations Gary Kline and County Solicitor Jacqueline Pfursich (together, the “County Defendants”).

A demurrer tests the legal sufficiency of the amended complaint. It admits all well-pleaded, material and relevant facts in the amended complaint and every inference fairly deducible from those facts. The court is not required to accept as true legal conclusions, unwarranted factual inferences, argumentative allegations, or expressions of opinion. The demurrer may be sustained only where the pleading is “facially devoid of merit,” that is, the law will not permit recovery, and any doubt must be resolved in favor of the non-moving party. *Chasan v. Platt*, 244 A.3d 73, 80 (Pa.Cmwlt. 2020) (Citations omitted).

Petitioner/Plaintiff’s claims pertain to decisions made in his custody and/or support cases, and those claims can only be raised within those matters. *Blake v. Garvin*, 588 A.2d 553, 555 (Pa.Super. 1991). They cannot be raised in a separate, collateral action. The doctrine of collateral estoppel bars further action on an issue that has already been litigated, despite the fact that the later action may be based on a cause of action different from the one previously litigated. *Pucci v. Workers’ Compensation Appeal Board (Woodville State Hospital)*, 707 A.2d 646, 647-48 (Pa.Cmwlt. 1998).

Petitioner/Plaintiff’s recourse is, and has always been, to seek relief within those cases, including filing a petition for modification of custody or support, and appeal any adverse decisions to a higher court having jurisdiction. For that reason, the amended petition will be dismissed with prejudice.⁴

⁴ The doctrine of collateral estoppel may be an unfamiliar concept for Petitioner/Plaintiff. At a conference with the court on August 8, 2025, Petitioner/Plaintiff represented himself as holding a doctorate degree in chemistry. In that discipline, asking a different laboratory to replicate an experiment conducted in another laboratory is accepted practice. That is the chemist’s way of testing the validity and accuracy of the result of an experiment obtained by the previous laboratory. That is not, however, how the law tests the validity and accuracy of judicial decisions. One who questions, or is dissatisfied, with a judicial decision may not start a new action or raise the same issues with another judge of the same court or relitigate issues already decided. Instead, the dissatisfied litigant must appeal to a higher court, which reviews the decisions of the lower court based upon the record developed in that

Alternatively, all of the Judicial Defendants are immune from suit.⁵ “[J]udicial immunity’ requires a two-part analysis: first, whether the judge has performed a judicial act; and second, whether the judge has some jurisdiction over the subject matter before [him].” *Chasan* at 81. It is evident from the face of the amended petition that the Judicial Defendants are named solely because they issued, may have issued or were thought to have issued rulings as judges within the scope of their authority in the custody and/or support-cases under their lawful jurisdiction.⁶ Judicial immunity includes immunity from liability for damages and for suit, even as to equitable claims seeking declaration that the judge’s acts were unconstitutional. *Chasan* at 82; *Guarrasi v. Scott*, 25 A.3d 394; 405 n. 11 (Pa.Cmwlth. 2011); *Logan v. Lille*, 728 A.2d 995 (Pa.Cmwlth. 1999).

“The doctrine of judicial immunity is applicable not only to judges but to those who perform judicial functions and act as an arm of the court.” *Logan* at 998. As the Director of the court’s Domestic Relations Section, Defendant Kline performs judicial functions and acts as an arm of the court. Therefore, he enjoys quasi-judicial immunity. *Jordan v. Domestic Relations Section of Erie*, 2013 WL 11275419, at 5 (Pa.Super. 2013).

lower court and the application of the law. The law affords litigants an opportunity to present their case and then an appellate review process by which to determine if the case was properly decided. The law does not afford litigants multiple opportunities to try the same issues before different judges or courts. That is because the policy considerations of the law are to streamline the administration of justice, maintain consistency during the course of a single case and bring litigation to an end while, at the same time, providing a mechanism by which to evaluate the validity and accuracy of the decisions made. At its most basic level, the discipline of the chemist is that of science, where its process is quantifiable, formulaic and capable of precise repetition whereas the discipline of the law is less structured and replete with human judgment and discretion, and where the goal is fairness rather than precision.

⁵ The affirmative defense of immunity may be raised as a preliminary objection. *Chasan* at 80-81; *Guarrasi* at 394 n. 11.

⁶ The amended petition names Senior Judge Mahon as the presiding judge in his custody and support case. It alleges Senior Judge Mahon is the “agent” of Chief Justice Todd. First Amended Petition at p 5. The Lancaster County judges are named as defendants because some of the orders in the support case were signed “*per curiam*.” First Amended Petition at para. 17.

Although the remaining County Defendants may be considered “high public officials” and, as such, entitled to immunity from suit arising out of actions taken in the course of their official duties and within the scope of their authority, such immunity appears to be limited to instances where money damages is claimed against them or their public employer or where the relief sought is to compel them to take affirmative action. Suits which seek to restrain state or county officials from performing affirmative acts are not within the rule of immunity.

Montgomery County Conservation District v. Bydalek, 261 A.3d 1073 (Pa.Cmwth. 2021).

However, Petitioner/Plaintiff makes no allegations of any fact about any of the remaining County Defendants. Pennsylvania is a fact-pleading state, and each defendant is entitled to know the specific factual basis upon which a claim is made in order to prepare a proper defense.⁷ Therefore, as to them, the amended petition is insufficiently specific.

Finally, Count VIII of the amended petition seeks to have any law regarding “child” or “children” be declared void for vagueness. Read in context with the amended petition, the challenge pertains to the realm of custody and support. The word “child” is defined under the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act as “[a]n individual who has not attained 18 years of age,” 23 Pa.C.S. § 5402; under the Intrastate Family Support Act as “[a]n individual, whether over or under the age of majority, who is or is alleged to be owed a duty of support by the individual’s parent or who is or is alleged to be the beneficiary of a support order directed to the parent,” 23 Pa.C.S. § 8101(b); and under Pa.R.C.P. 1915.1 as “an unemancipated individual under 18 years of age.”

Petitioner/Plaintiff claims “individual” leads to natural person which leads to person which is a tautomer for “child,” thus using the same word to define a word or, in

⁷ Given the gravamen of Petitioner/Plaintiff’s amended petition, it is unlikely any of the remaining named County Defendants have had any involvement whatsoever with his custody or support cases.

Petitioner/Plaintiff's words, "an infinite loop of the definition of child." *First Amended Petition* at para. 74. In chemistry, "tautomer" is where each of two isomers of a compound exist together in equilibrium and are readily interchanged or interconverted with each other. It is similar to a tautology, which is a needless repetition of words meaning the same thing, like describing an unmarried man as a "single bachelor." However, a "child" is a sub-set of "person" or "individual." They are not the same or mutually interchangeable. All children are persons or individuals, but not all persons or individuals are children. Therefore, on the face of the First Amended Petition, Plaintiff's challenge to the word "child" or "children" as vague is dismissed as frivolous.

BY THE COURT:



EDWARD D. REIBMAN, Senior Judge
Specially Presiding



December 10, 2025

Attest:

CC: Mr. Blair Jesse Reich
227 Cherry Street
Columbia, PA 17512

David J. MacMain, Esquire
MacMain Leinhaus
433 W. Market Street, Suite 200
West Chester, PA 19382

Sonya Kivisto, Legal Counsel
Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts
Pennsylvania Judicial Center
601 Commonwealth Avenue
P.O. Box 61260
Harrisburg, PA 17106-1260

Christine Carrigan (copy via electronic mail)
mailed - 12/11/2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE COURT
JUDICIAL CENTER
601 COMMONWEALTH AVENUE
HARRISBURG, PA 17106-1260
12/11/2025

CONFORMED
COPY

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LANCASTER COUNTY,
PENNSYLVANIA
CIVIL DIVISION

ALENE WILMOTH REICH
Plaintiff

VS.

BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH
Defendant

Nos. 20-06144

ENTERED AND FILED
2024 NOV 22 AM 8:54
PROTHONOTARY'S OFFICE
LANCASTER, PA.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 22nd day of November, 2024, upon consideration of Defendant's "Motion to Reconsider Divorce Bifurcation By Affidavit", and any response thereto, it is HEREBY ORDERED AND DECREED that the requested relief is DENIED. 1

BY THE COURT:




William P. Mahon,
Senior Judge



1. This request was previously denied by an unappealed order of this court and is now the law of the case. The undersigned cannot arbitrarily overrule that decision of a judge of the same court unless that decision is clearly in error, which it was not.

Copies to:

Wendy Chan, Esq., Attorney for Plaintiff
Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich, Defendant, *pro se*
Christine Bailey, Supervisor Team 1 DRS

Attest: 

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER OR DECREE
PURSUANT TO PA. R.C.P. NO. 236
NOTIFICATION - THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT
HAS BEEN FILED IN THIS CASE
PROTHONOTARY OF LANCASTER CO., PA
DATE: 11/22/24

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF
LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CIVIL DIVISION

ALENE WILMOUTH REICH

V.

CI-20-06144

BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH

FILED AND FILED
2025 JAN 30 AM 9:34
PROTHONOTARY'S OFFICE
LANCASTER, PA.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 29th day of January, 2025, it is HEREBY ORDERED AND DECREED, that Defendant's filing of November 4, 2024 seeking to file a counterclaim in divorce for breach of contract is DENIED.[1] The Hearing Master shall proceed with all claims pursuant to the court's prior order of September 25, 2024.

BY THE COURT

William P Mahon S.J.



Attest: 

[1] This counterclaim is untimely and improperly filed without court approval. See Pa.R.C.P. 1031; 1033. Even if filed properly, it would be denied. Defendant concedes that this claim is premised upon the parties' marital vows even though he concedes that those vows are silent regarding future economic circumstances between them. Based upon that silence, defendant argues that 23 Pa.C.S.A 3105(c) deprives this court of jurisdiction over equitable jurisdiction issues, specifically alimony, alimony pendente lite, counsel fees and expenses, analogizing this silence to a pre-nuptial agreement. This argument has no basis in fact or law. The rationale of the Superior Court's unpublished decision in *Cruz v. Morales*, 2023 WL 3270883 (Super. Ct. 5/5/2023) provides insight and persuasive rationale and authority on this issue. Without clear and unambiguous language to the contrary, all marriage vows can be terminated by the filing of a divorce action. There is no such language relied upon by defendant in suggesting this counterclaim.

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER OR DECREE
PURSUANT TO PA. R.C.P. NO. 236
NOTIFICATION - THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT
HAS BEEN FILED IN THIS CASE
PROTHONOTARY OF LANCASTER CO., PA
DATE: 1/30/25

CONFORMED
COPY

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CIVIL DIVISION

BLAIR JESSE REICH,
Plaintiff

VS.

ALENE WILMOTH REICH,
Defendant

CI-21-02607 (Custody)

RECORDED
27 AUG 2025

ORDER

AND NOW, this 27th day of August, 2025, plaintiff's Motion to Recuse the undersigned is HEREBY DENIED.[1]

Attest: C. Thomas
cc: Blair Jesse Reich Pro Se (2)

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER OR DECREE
PURSUANT TO PA. R.C.P. NO. 236
NOTIFICATION - THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT
HAS BEEN FILED IN THIS CASE
PROTHONOTARY OF LANCASTER CO., PA
DATE: 8/27/2025

BY THE COURT:

/s/ William P. Mahon

William P. Mahon



[1] Plaintiff's request to recuse is premised upon his belief, as well as other beliefs, that the court is part of a conspiracy to engage in the unfamiliar philosophy of "negromancy" which results in the commission of the capital crimes of treason and sedition. Despite being named as a defendant by this plaintiff through a motion for habeas relief in a separate action, the recusal request is denied. The reasoning for not recusing was placed on the record in this action at a custody hearing held on August 22, 2025 and is incorporated herein. In short, defendant was informed by the undersigned that no judge would subscribe to his views that are those of a "sovereign citizen" and therefore his belief system would never be given credence in a judicial proceeding. See generally *Commonwealth v. Syke*, 326 A.3d. 450;

2024 WL 3878319 (Super. Ct. 2024) (unpublished opinion cited as persuasive authority that such claims are frivolous). Further, pursuant to a corollary of the “doctrine of necessity”, the undersigned will not recuse for to do so will perpetuate plaintiff’s attempts to thwart the judicial process by filing lawsuits against judges and espousing his belief system. *See generally Stilp v. Commonwealth et.al*, 905 A.2d. 918 (Pa. 2006). Having served on the bench for over 25 years and having been named previously as a judicial defendant, plaintiff’s actions have no impact on the undersigned because of the application of judicial immunity and its corollaries. Plaintiff has previously taken actions that resulted in the recusal of all members of the Lancaster County Court of Common Pleas. Plaintiff’s philosophies will ultimately result in no jurist being able to resolve this custody matter. This cannot be, even if there is the appearance of impropriety by having a jurist preside over a proceeding involving a party who has named that jurist as a defendant in another action. In these circumstances, the matter of recusal lies within the jurist and whether, in good conscience and pursuant to the Code of Judicial Conduct, that jurist can remain fair and impartial. The undersigned can do so herein, especially where there is no pecuniary interest at risk. Plaintiff has been told if at some point the conscience of the undersigned changes, then recusal will occur.

One of
many
examples
of
deliberate
indifference

Deeply Disconcerting Custody Order Sua Sponte Deprivation
Change in form of Custody

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CIVIL DIVISION

BLAIR JESSE REICH,
Plaintiff

VS.

CI-21-02607 (Custody)

ALENE WILMOTH REICH,
Defendant

ORDER


AND NOW, this 16th day of June, 2025, after conducting a record custody conference at which the "Life Solutions Behavioral Counseling Services" evaluation was discussed with the parties [1], it is HEREBY ORDERED that physical custody of the parties' three (3) minor children: IR, ER and JR, shall remain with mother pending further custody order after a full custody hearing is scheduled and completed.[2] Telephone contact between father and children can take place with the consent of mother pending a further court custody order. [3]

2025 JUN 17 PM 5:00
JAMES M. MATOS, CLERK

BY THE COURT:

William P Mahon

William P. Mahon, S.J.



Attest: J. Matos, clerk

[1] This evaluation was provided to the court on the morning of 6/16/2025, having been provided to the parties the day before. A final custody hearing has previously been continued herein, by agreement of the parties, pending completion of this evaluation. Because of the timing of the receipt of the evaluation, neither the court nor the parties were able to proceed with the final custody hearing. Instead, the court discussed with the parties how they wished to proceed after receipt of the evaluation. Father wishes a full custody hearing where the therapists and children must testify.

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER OR DECREE
PURSUANT TO PA. R.C.P. NO. 236
NOTIFICATION - THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT
HAS BEEN FILED IN THIS CASE
NOTARY PUBLIC OF LANCASTER CO., PA
JAMES M. MATOS

[2] Upon receipt of the evaluation by father, which contained recommendations that mother have physical custody of the three (3) children, and wherein IR and ER expressed to the therapists their desire to reside with mother, father informed his children that if he does not retain 50/50 physical custody, he wants no custody. This statement greatly upset the children, who are now in mother's custody pursuant to the existing custody order. Father appears either to not comprehend the trauma that his foregoing statement would have upon his children or is intending to pressure his daughters to change their expressed desire, as set forth in the evaluation, to reside with mother.

Lancaster County court administration is attempting to schedule forthwith a suitable time for the final custody hearing.

[3] Father promised not to speak with the children about the evaluation nor discuss custody matters during any telephone conversation. The call will take place solely in the discretion of mother since the children may not wish to speak with father after being told by him that there may exist circumstances wherein, he wants no custody of his children.

Wendy Chan, Esq., Attorney for Defendant ()
Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich, Plaintiff, *pro se* ()
Christine Bailey, Domestic Relations ()

PROTHONOTARY
ORIGINAL

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LANCASTER COUNTY,
PENNSYLVANIA
CIVIL DIVISION

BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH

No. 2021-02607

VS.

CUSTODY

ALENE WILMOTH REICH

2024 SEP 25 11:53 AM

ORDER

AND NOW, this 25th day of September 2024, it is ORDERED that, by agreement of the parties, the following custody provision be adopted as an order of court in addition to the provisions of the currently existing custody order dated December 20, 2023:

Both parties agree that they are bound by, and will comply with, the requirements of 23 Pa.C.S.A. 5208.

All provisions of the December 20, 2023 custody order shall be unaffected and remain in effect.

BY THE COURT:

W. Mahor
William P. Mahor,
Senior Judge



*Anti
abduction
measures*

Copies to:

Wendy Chan, Esq., Attorney for Plaintiff (1)

Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich, Defendant, *pro se* (1)

Hester J. Matos, clerk

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER OR DECREE
PURSUANT TO PA. R.C.P. NO. 236
NOTIFICATION - THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT
HAS BEEN FILED IN THIS CASE
PROTHONOTARY OF LANCASTER CO., PA
DATE: 9 27, 24

CONFORMED
COPY

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CIVIL DIVISION

BLAIR JESSE REICH,

Plaintiff

VS.

ALENE WILMOTH REICH,

Defendant

CI-21-02607 (Custody)

2025 AUG 27 11:19:37

ORDER

AND NOW, this 27th day of August, 2025, plaintiff's Motion to Strike this action is HEREBY DENIED.[1]

BY THE COURT

/s/ William P Mahon

William P. Mahon, S



[1] Defendant objects. To allow this action to be withdrawn would require the filing of a new action and would seriously delay the court from addressing important custody issues. Further, withdrawal would waste years of judicial and party time and resources. Withdrawal is not in the best interest of the parties' children.

Attest: C Thomas

cc: BLAIR Jesse Reich Pro Se @

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER OR DECREE
PURSUANT TO PA. R.C.P. NO. 236
NOTIFICATION - THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT
HAS BEEN FILED IN THIS CASE
PROTHONOTARY OF LANCASTER CO., PA
DATE: *8/27/2025*

CONFORMED
COPY

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

CIVIL DIVISION

BLAIR JESSE REICH,
Plaintiff

VS.

ALENE WILMOTH REICH,
Defendant

CI-21-02607 (Custody)

2025 AUG 27 PM 10:37

ORDER

AND NOW, this 27th day of August, 2025, plaintiff's Motion to Recuse the undersigned is HEREBY DENIED.[1]

Attest: C. Thomas
cc: Blair Jesse Reich Pro Se (2)

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER OR DECREE
PURSUANT TO PA. R.C.P. NO. 236
NOTIFICATION - THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT
HAS BEEN FILED IN THIS CASE
PROTHONOTARY OF LANCASTER CO., PA
DATE: 8/27/2025

BY THE COURT:

/s/ William P. Mahon

William P. Mahon, S.J.



[1] Plaintiff's request to recuse is premised upon his belief, as well as other beliefs, that the court is part of a conspiracy to engage in the unfamiliar philosophy of "negromancy" which results in the commission of the capital crimes of treason and sedition. Despite being named as a defendant by this plaintiff through a motion for habeas relief in a separate action, the recusal request is denied. The reasoning for not recusing was placed on the record in this action at a custody hearing held on August 22, 2025 and is incorporated herein. In short, defendant was informed by the undersigned that no judge would subscribe to his views that are those of a "sovereign citizen" and therefore his belief system would never be given credence in a judicial proceeding. See generally *Commonwealth v. Syke*, 326 A.3d. 450;

2024 WL 3878319 (Super. Ct. 2024) (unpublished opinion cited as persuasive authority that such claims are frivolous). Further, pursuant to a corollary of the “doctrine of necessity”, the undersigned will not recuse for to do so will perpetuate plaintiff’s attempts to thwart the judicial process by filing lawsuits against judges and espousing his belief system. *See generally Stilp v. Commonwealth et.al*, 905 A.2d. 918 (Pa. 2006). Having served on the bench for over 25 years and having been named previously as a judicial defendant, plaintiff’s actions have no impact on the undersigned because of the application of judicial immunity and its corollaries. Plaintiff has previously taken actions that resulted in the recusal of all members of the Lancaster County Court of Common Pleas. Plaintiff’s philosophies will ultimately result in no jurist being able to resolve this custody matter. This cannot be, even if there is the appearance of impropriety by having a jurist preside over a proceeding involving a party who has named that jurist as a defendant in another action. In these circumstances, the matter of recusal lies within the jurist and whether, in good conscience and pursuant to the Code of Judicial Conduct, that jurist can remain fair and impartial. The undersigned can do so herein, especially where there is no pecuniary interest at risk. Plaintiff has been told if at some point the conscience of the undersigned changes, then recusal will occur.

NOV 06 2025

LANCASTER COUNTY
DOMESTIC RELATIONS

In the Court of Common Pleas of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania

DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

Alene Wilmoth Reich

Docket Number 2021-00333

Plaintiff

vs.

PACSES Case Number 967300735

Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich

Defendant

Other State ID Number

ORDER

AND NOW, on this 6th day of November, 2025, it is **HEREBY ORDERED** and **DECREED** that defendant's "Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice Wife's Petition for Contempt" is **DENIED**.^[1]

BY THE COURT:

/s/ William P Mahon

WILLIAM P MAHON S.J.

[1] This motion is just another example of defendant's litigation violence against plaintiff and the courts. It contains no cognizable requests for relief but is rather a manifesto in opposition to the justice system. The motion is a convoluted attempt to assert the supremacy of federal law in Pennsylvania spousal and child support matters. There is no legal forum in which defendant's views are cognizable.

NOV 25 2024

LANCASTER COUNTY
DOMESTIC RELATIONS

**In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION**

Alene Wilmoth Reich
Plaintiff

Docket Number 2021-00333

vs.

PACSES Case Number 967300735


Blair Jesse Elynn Reich
Defendant

Other State ID Number

ORDER

AND NOW, on this 25th day of November, 2024, after a complex support hearing, it is **HEREBY ORDERED** that all defendant's requests for support modification are **DENIED**.¹ The April 16, 2024 recommended Interim Order shall remain in effect as a final support order.²

BY THE COURT:



WILLIAM P MAHON SENIOR JUDGE

1. Prior counsel for defendant filed for modification on November 21, 2023 while the Superior Court appeal of the trial court's May 16, 2023 support order was pending. That order was affirmed by the Superior Court on February 16, 2024. Defendant has made various support modification requests as well as judicial system commentary interwoven with "sovereign citizen" pronouncements (i.e. Petition for Modification - "Again, not out of consent for the ongoing matters but out of duress for his physical, emotional, and financial safety, Blair, man and registered agent for the REGISTERED ORGANIZATION by the name of BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH herein petitions this administrative proceeding disguised as a "COURT" for modification" and in related custody litigation "Institutionalized Toxic Femininity in the Judicial System Resulting from SSA TITLE IV Federal Kickbacks to the Judiciary and Impact to the Instant Matter Regarding COURT Enabling of Cyclic Detrimental Female Behavior"). The trial court entered an interim unallocated support order dated April 16, 2024 which is the current order from which defendant seeks relief.
2. This is defendant's third complex support hearing since his initial complaint filed on February 18, 2022. Defendant is a gaming and cryptocurrency entrepreneur. He is contending that his income has been drastically reduced since the trial court's 2023 income determination, and the Superior Court's affirmance, of his gross annual salary of \$ [REDACTED]

on May 15, 2024. That salary was calculated by adding his W-2 2020 yearly salary from Steem Monsters LLC (Steem) and a 2021 tax return reflecting income in business income from Peace Prosperity and Freedom LLC (PPF). (PPF pays defendant consulting fees but its only client is Steem). These income figures are what the trial court has used throughout in calculating defendant's support obligations. Defendant now contends that his 2023 Steem salary has been reduced to [redacted] for 2023 (and perhaps further reduced to [redacted] in 2024) and his 2022 PPF income to [redacted], for a total annual income reduction to [redacted] (a reduction in yearly income of [redacted]). However, defendant did not provide PPF's 2023 tax return nor did he provide his personal 2023 income tax returns in order to verify income. Defendant testified during the current hearing, without further explanation, that he has not filed personal income tax returns "...for a couple of years or so...". Defendant's 2023 personal tax return would shed needed light on the extent and sources of his income, as would the corporate tax return of Invennum Corp. (Invennum) when considering the complexity of defendant's financial involvement in multiple related corporate and non-profit entities. For example, defendant testified that he is paid his Invennum salary by Steem but Invennum must reimburse Steem for those payments. He also testified that "he is" Invennum but it is owned wholly by Steem. Defendant testified that although he is a founder of Steem and owns 40% of its stock (7 million shares), he was removed as an officer in a power struggle. However, he produced a Steem corporate resolution in support of that contention that does not support that testimony.

Defendant further testified about the corporate entities that he founded and in which he has significant ownership or control interests (i.e. Steem [founder and 40% ownership]; Splinterland Company [either a d/b/a fictitious name for Steem or a British Virgin Island non-profit]; PPF [founder and 99% ownership and 1% owned by his paramour]; Invennum Corp. [founder but owned by Steem]; Steem Engine Corp. [100% ownership]; SBS Foundation LTD [non-profit founder]). Defendant also testified that some of the non-profits which he established were created in Singapore and the British Virgin Islands.

Defendant confirmed that he is the owner of possibly hundreds of "smart contracts" that regulate his ownership of an unknown amount of various "alternative cryptocurrencies", including bitcoin and a cryptocurrency currency that he created. His testimony was that he has an unknown number of bitcoins in at least one of these smart contracts: at least one bitcoin and maybe as many as ten bitcoins, but he was unsure. This testimony was elusive and defendant was unable to accurately value those currencies. However, he confirmed that each bitcoin is worth \$98,000 to \$99,000. He testified that he can liquidate his cryptocurrencies but the court cannot order him to do so because that would be confiscatory and he needs those currencies for his gaming businesses but offered no other proof for that statement. Defendant is incorrect in his belief in these circumstances. *See Sichelstiel v. Sichelstiel*, 272 A3d. 530 (Super. Ct. 2022).

Defendant explained that the above entities exchange cryptocurrencies among themselves and with "electronic gamers" throughout the world. Much of the commerce within this inter-related corporate structure and world-wide gamer industry involved payments in bitcoin and other alternate cryptocurrencies, including the cryptocurrency established by defendant. Defendant's testimony attempts to present the corporate structure he created

herein, and the nature of cryptocurrencies involved, as being inextricably interrelated and almost incapable of precise monitoring and valuation. He testified that he is unable to find adequate financial and accounting expertise to properly do so.

The court finds defendant's testimony not credible in general and further as to the sources and valuation of his salary and business income and assets. Despite testifying that there may be a decrease in defendant's income from both Steem and PPF, defendant's failure to: 1) file personal income tax returns wherein he would memorialize his total income for at least 2023; 2) failure to provide PPF's 2023 tax return; 3) failure to provide any tax returns for Invennum; and 4) presenting a contradictory Steem corporate resolution that does not support his claim that he was relieved of his Steem corporate position, all, individually and in combination, significantly militate against defendant's claims for relief.

Other than defendant's incredible claim of reduced income, the income and expense numbers of the parties remained the same as utilized in calculating the April 16, 2024 interim order. Since defendant has not carried his burden of proof that his income has actually been reduced rather than artificially manipulated, the undersigned adopts the April 16, 2024 support order, and the calculations upon which it is premised, as the final support order herein.

In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

ALENE W. REICH

Plaintiff

vs.

BLAIR J. REICH

Defendant

) Docket Number: 2021-00333

)

) PACSES Case Number: 967300735

) PACSES Order Number: 2021-0333

) Other State ID Number:

ORDER TO FREEZE ASSETS

AND NOW, this 17TH DAY OF JANUARY, 2025,  BANK is hereby Ordered to freeze assets up to \$32,307.07 belonging to: BLAIR J. REICH, Social Security Number , in account numbe  until further Notice of this court. This action is taken in accordance with Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes Title 23 Sections 4304.1 and 4305 and Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure 1910.23 and 1910.26 and shall remain in effect until further notice of action is received from this court.

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO GARNISH FEDERAL BENEFITS

Title 42 of the United States Code § 666 allows for the garnishment of federal benefit monies deposited into financial accounts for child support enforcement purposes.

Accordingly, the garnishee is hereby notified that the procedures established under 31 CFR Part 212 for identifying and protecting federal benefits deposited to accounts at financial institutions do not apply to this garnishment order.

The garnishee must comply with the terms of this order, including instructions for withholding and retaining any funds deposited to any account(s) covered by this order, pending further order of this court.

BY THE COURT:

PER CURIAM

JUDGE

JANUARY 17, 2025

Date



In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

ALENE W. REICH

vs.

BLAIR J. REICH

Plaintiff

Defendant

) Docket Number: 2021-00333

)

) PACSES Case Number: 967300735

) PACSES Order Number: 2021-0333

) Other State ID Number:

ORDER TO SEIZE ASSETS

AND NOW, this 13TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2025, _____ BANK is

hereby Ordered to seize assets not to exceed \$32,307.07 belonging to:

BLAIR J. REICH, Social Security Number _____ 3788, in account number:

_____ #05. The balance of assets which exceed the amount specified for seizure is hereby released to the account holder(s). If the funds available in the account at the time of receipt of this Order do not satisfy the amount specified for seizure, remit all available funds as ordered and release the account. You are further directed to forward the seized assets in strict accordance with the attached payment instructions.

This Order is issued pursuant to Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes Title 23 Sections 4304.1 and 4305 and Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure 1910.23 and 1910.26, which provide for seizure of assets held by financial institutions for non-payment of support.

BY THE COURT:

PER CURIAM

JUDGE

FEBRUARY 13, 2025

Date

In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

ALENE W. REICH
vs.
BLAIR J. REICH

Plaintiff
Defendant

) Docket Number: 2021-00333
)
) PACSES Case Number: 967300735
) PACSES Order Number: 2021-0333
) Other State ID Number:

ORDER TO SEIZE ASSETS

AND NOW, this 13TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2025,

{ _____ CREDIT UNION is hereby Ordered to seize assets not to exceed \$32,307.07 belonging to: BLAIR J. REICH, Social Security Number _____-3788, in account number: _____ 91-3. The balance of assets which exceed the amount specified for seizure is hereby released to the account holder(s). If the funds available in the account at the time of receipt of this Order do not satisfy the amount specified for seizure, remit all available funds as ordered and release the account. You are further directed to forward the seized assets in strict accordance with the attached payment instructions.

This Order is issued pursuant to Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes Title 23 Sections 4304.1 and 4305 and Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure 1910.23 and 1910.26, which provide for seizure of assets held by financial institutions for non-payment of support.

BY THE COURT:

PER CURIAM

JUDGE

FEBRUARY 13, 2025

Date

NOV 25 2024

LANCASTER COUNTY
DOMESTIC RELATIONS

**In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION**

Alene Wilmoth Reich
Plaintiff

vs.

Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich
Defendant

Docket Number 2021-00333


PACSES Case Number 967300735

Other State ID Number

ORDER

AND NOW, on this 25th day of November, 2024, after a complex support hearing, it is **HEREBY ORDERED** that all defendant's requests for support modification are **DENIED**.¹ The April 16, 2024 recommended Interim Order shall remain in effect as a final support order.²

BY THE COURT:



WILLIAM P MAHON SENIOR JUDGE

1. Prior counsel for defendant filed for modification on November 21, 2023 while the Superior Court appeal of the trial court's May 16, 2023 support order was pending. That order was affirmed by the Superior Court on February 16, 2024. Defendant has made various support modification requests as well as judicial system commentary interwoven with "sovereign citizen" pronouncements (i.e. Petition for Modification – "Again, not out of consent for the ongoing matters but out of duress for his physical, emotional, and financial safety, Blair, man and registered agent for the REGISTERED ORGANIZATION by the name of BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH herein petitions this administrative proceeding disguised as a "COURT" for modification" and in related custody litigation "Institutionalized Toxic Femininity in the Judicial System Resulting from SSA TITLE IV Federal Kickbacks to the Judiciary and Impact to the Instant Matter Regarding COURT Enabling of Cyclic Detrimental Female Behavior"). The trial court entered an interim unallocated support order dated April 16, 2024 which is the current order from which defendant seeks relief.
2. This is defendant's third complex support hearing since his initial complaint filed on February 18, 2022. Defendant is a gaming and cryptocurrency entrepreneur. He is contending that his income has been drastically reduced since the trial court's 2023 income determination, and the Superior Court's affirmation, of his gross annual salary of

In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania

DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

PO BOX 83479, LANCASTER, PA. 17608-3479

Phone: (717) 299-8141

SEPTEMBER 12, 2025

Fax: (717) 293-7270



BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH
227 CHERRY ST
COLUMBIA PA 17512-1409

Plaintiff Name: ALENE W. REICH
Defendant Name: BLAIR J. REICH
Defendant SSN: 3788
Docket Number: 2021-00333
PACSES Case Number: 967300735
Member ID Number: 2420300093
Order Number: 2021-0333
Account Number: 1-3
Financial Institution: DIGITAL FEDERAL CREDIT UNION

Please note: All correspondence must include the PACSES Case Number.

NOTICE OF FREEZING/SEIZING OF ASSETS

Dear BLAIR J. REICH

As required by Federal Law, 42 U.S.C. Section 666, and State Law, 23 Pa. C.S. § 4304.1(b.1), computer data matches are conducted between all obligors who owe overdue support and financial institutions. This match has identified you as owing overdue support arrears and owning an asset or assets held by a financial institution. As a result of the overdue support that you owe, in accordance with PA RCP 1910.23, an order freezing your asset(s) has been entered by the court and served upon the financial institution holding that asset or assets. The amount of your arrears is \$38,349.46 as of SEPTEMBER 12, 2025. Once the arrears have been paid, an Order to release the remaining asset(s) will be sent to the financial institution to terminate the freeze of asset or assets.

NOTE: 31 CFR Part 212 allows for the garnishment of protected federal benefits.

You have a right to contest this Notice within thirty (30) days of the date appearing on this Notice. Your contest is limited to the following: (1) no overdue support exists; (2) there is a mistake in the amount of overdue support; (3) there is a mistake in the identity of the obligor; or (4) the account is not subject to attachment as a matter of law. Contact the DRS listed above for instructions on how to contest this notice. The objections must be received within the thirty (30) day period. If you do not contest this notice within (30) days of the date of this notice or pay your arrears balance in full, the entire asset(s) up to the amount stated above will be seized from your account and applied to your support case(s).

Sincerely,

TEAM 3 M-R

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LANCASTER COUNTY,
PENNSYLVANIA
CIVIL DIVISION

ENTERED AND FILED

NOV 20 2024

LANCASTER COUNTY
DOMESTIC RELATIONS

ALENE WILMOTH REICH
Plaintiff

Nos. 21-00333


VS.

BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH
Defendant

ORDER

AND NOW, this ^{20th} day of November, 2024, upon consideration of Defendant's "Notice and Petition Regarding Support Matter By Affidavit", and any response thereto, it is HEREBY ORDERED AND DECREED that the requested relief is DENIED. 1

BY THE COURT:


William P. Mahon,
Senior Judge

1. Defendant's Notice and Petition is incomprehensible in its majority and therefore incapable of meaningful review. The Petition for Modification of support can be presented and addressed at a hearing scheduled for November 22, 2024.

Copies to:

Wendy Chan, Esq., Attorney for Plaintiff
Blair Jesse Elyn Reich, Defendant, *pro se*
Christine Bailey, Supervisor Team 1 DRS

In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

ALENE W. REICH
vs. Plaintiff

BLAIR J. REICH
Defendant

) Docket Number: 2021-00333
)
) PACSES Case Number: 967300735
) PACSES Order Number: 2021-0333
) Other State ID Number:

ENTERED AND FILED

FEB 13 2025

LANCASTER COUNTY
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

ORDER TO SEIZE ASSETS

AND NOW, this 13TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2025,

_____ CREDIT UNION is hereby Ordered to seize assets not to exceed \$32,307.07 belonging to: BLAIR J. REICH, Social Security Number _____ 788, in account number: _____ 91-3. The balance of assets which exceed the amount specified for seizure is hereby released to the account holder(s). If the funds available in the account at the time of receipt of this Order do not satisfy the amount specified for seizure, remit all available funds as ordered and release the account. You are further directed to forward the seized assets in strict accordance with the attached payment instructions.

This Order is issued pursuant to Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes Title 23 Sections 4304.1 and 4305 and Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure 1910.23 and 1910.26, which provide for seizure of assets held by financial institutions for non-payment of support.

BY THE COURT:

PER CURIAM

JUDGE

FEBRUARY 13, 2025

Date

In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

ALENE W. REICH

vs.

BLAIR J. REICH

Plaintiff

Defendant

) Docket Number: 2021-00333

)

) PACSES Case Number: 967300735

) PACSES Order Number: 2021-0333

) Other State ID Number: ENTERED AND FILED

FEB 13 2025

ORDER TO SEIZE ASSETS

LANCASTER COUNTY
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

AND NOW, this 13TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2025, [REDACTED] BANK is hereby Ordered to seize assets not to exceed \$32,307.07 belonging to: BLAIR J. REICH, Social Security Number [REDACTED] 3788, in account number: [REDACTED] 105. The balance of assets which exceed the amount specified for seizure is hereby released to the account holder(s). If the funds available in the account at the time of receipt of this Order do not satisfy the amount specified for seizure, remit all available funds as ordered and release the account. You are further directed to forward the seized assets in strict accordance with the attached payment instructions.

This Order is issued pursuant to Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes Title 23 Sections 4304.1 and 4305 and Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure 1910.23 and 1910.26, which provide for seizure of assets held by financial institutions for non-payment of support.

BY THE COURT:

PER CURIAM

JUDGE

FEBRUARY 13, 2025

Date

In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania

DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

PO BOX 83479, LANCASTER, PA. 17608-3479

Phone: (717) 299-8141

JANUARY 17, 2025

Fax: (717) 293-7270



BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH
227 CHERRY ST
COLUMBIA PA 17512-1409

Plaintiff Name: ALENE W. REICH
Defendant Name: BLAIR J. REICH
Defendant SSN: 3788
Docket Number: 2021-00333
PACSES Case Number: 967300735
Member ID Number: 2420300093
Order Number: 2021-0333
Account Number: 191-3
Financial Institution: _____, CREDIT UNION

Please note: All correspondence must include the PACSES Case Number.

NOTICE OF FREEZING/SEIZING OF ASSETS

Dear BLAIR J. REICH

As required by Federal Law, 42 U.S.C. Section 666, and State Law, 23 Pa. C.S. § 4304.1(b.1), computer data matches are conducted between all obligors who owe overdue support and financial institutions. This match has identified you as owing overdue support arrears and owning an asset or assets held by a financial institution. As a result of the overdue support that you owe, in accordance with PA RCP 1910.23, an order freezing your asset(s) has been entered by the court and served upon the financial institution holding that asset or assets. The amount of your arrears is \$32,307.07 as of JANUARY 17, 2025. Once the arrears have been paid, an Order to release the remaining asset(s) will be sent to the financial institution to terminate the freeze of asset or assets.

NOTE: 31 CFR Part 212 allows for the garnishment of protected federal benefits.

You have a right to contest this Notice within thirty (30) days of the date appearing on this Notice. Your contest is limited to the following: (1) no overdue support exists; (2) there is a mistake in the amount of overdue support; (3) there is a mistake in the identity of the obligor; or (4) the account is not subject to attachment as a matter of law. Contact the DRS listed above for instructions on how to contest this notice. The objections must be received within the thirty (30) day period. If you do not contest this notice within (30) days of the date of this notice or pay your arrears balance in full, the entire asset(s) up to the amount stated above will be seized from your account and applied to your support case(s).

Sincerely,

TEAM 3 M-R



Service Type M

Form EN-502 12/20

Worker ID \$GAM

In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION



BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH
227 CHERRY ST
COLUMBIA PA 17512-1409

ALENE W. REICH

vs.

BLAIR J. REICH

Plaintiff

Defendant

) Docket Number: 2021-00333
)
) PACSES Case Number: 967300735
)
) Other State ID Number:

Notice of Decision

Dear BLAIR J. REICH

On FEBRUARY 13, 2025 the Domestic Relations Section of the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County took the following action upon the objections to the Proposed Action,

Order to Freeze Assets

- 1. The objections are sustained and the proposed action shall not be initiated.
- 2. The objections are sustained and the proposed action shall be modified as follows:
- 3. The objections are dismissed and the proposed action shall be initiated for the following reasons:
 - Order to Seize Assets shall be processed.

Sincerely,

TEAM 3 M-R



Service Type M

Form EN-010 09/17
Worker ID 36354



In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

ALENE W. REICH
vs. Plaintiff
BLAIR J. REICH
Defendant

) Docket Number: 2021-00333
)
) PACSES Case Number: 967300735
) PACSES Order Number: 2021-0333
) Other State ID Number:

ENTERED AND FILED

OCT - 2 2025

LANCASTER COUNTY
DOMESTIC RELATIONS

ORDER TO SEIZE ASSETS

AND NOW, this 2ND DAY OF OCTOBER, 2025,

██████████ CREDIT UNION is hereby Ordered to seize assets not to exceed \$38,349.46 belonging to: BLAIR J. REICH, Social Security Number ██████████ 3788, in account number: ██████████ 91-3. The balance of assets which exceed the amount specified for seizure is hereby released to the account holder(s). If the funds available in the account at the time of receipt of this Order do not satisfy the amount specified for seizure, remit all available funds as ordered and release the account. You are further directed to forward the seized assets in strict accordance with the attached payment instructions.

This Order is issued pursuant to Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes Title 23 Sections 4304.1 and 4305 and Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure 1910.23 and 1910.26, which provide for seizure of assets held by financial institutions for non-payment of support.

BY THE COURT:

ENTERED AND FILED

OCT 2 2025
LANCASTER COUNTY
DOMESTIC RELATIONS

PER CURIAM

JUDGE

OCTOBER 2, 2025

Date

In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

ALENE W. REICH

Plaintiff

vs.

BLAIR J. REICH

Defendant

) Docket Number: 2021-00333

)

) PACSES Case Number: 967300735

) PACSES Order Number: 2021-0333

) Other State ID Number:

ORDER TO FREEZE ASSETS

AND NOW, this 10TH DAY OF JANUARY, 2025,

██████████ CREDIT UNION is hereby Ordered to freeze assets up to \$32,307.07 belonging to: BLAIR J. REICH, Social Security Number: ██████████3788, in account number: ██████████ 11-3 until further Notice of this court. This action is taken in accordance with Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes Title 23 Sections 4304.1 and 4305 and Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure 1910.23 and 1910.26 and shall remain in effect until further notice of action is received from this court.

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO GARNISH FEDERAL BENEFITS

Title 42 of the United States Code § 666 allows for the garnishment of federal benefit monies deposited into financial accounts for child support enforcement purposes.

Accordingly, the garnishee is hereby notified that the procedures established under 31 CFR Part 212 for identifying and protecting federal benefits deposited to accounts at financial institutions do not apply to this garnishment order.

The garnishee must comply with the terms of this order, including instructions for withholding and retaining any funds deposited to any account(s) covered by this order, pending further order of this court.

BY THE COURT:

PER CURIAM

JUDGE

JANUARY 10, 2025

Date



In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

ENTERED AND FILED

2024 MAR 21 AM 9:00

DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

ALENE W. REICH

vs.

BLAIR J. REICH

Plaintiff

Defendant

) Docket Number: 2021-00333

) PACSES Case Number: 967300735

) Other State ID Number:

ORDER OF COURT

Recommended Interim Final

AND NOW, this 18TH DAY OF MARCH, 2024 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED

that the:

- Respondent, BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, is not found to be in contempt.
- case is continued and it is ordered and directed as follows: this case shall be listed for further hearing by this Court on July 31, 2024, at 1:30pm. Respondent in this case is:

BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH

Hearing to be held in Courtroom #7.

At the above scheduled proceeding, contempt may be dismissed, new and/or modified purge conditions may be imposed or incarceration recommended for the defendant. If the plaintiff fails to appear, the Court will proceed with the case and enter an appropriate order. **The parties are to remain until dismissed by the Court.**

YOU ARE REQUIRED TO BRING:

- Cash, credit card in your name, cashier/bank check or money order payable to DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION. **Contact your local DRS before the hearing date to verify which of the payment methods listed above are accepted.**
- Most recent pay stubs for any and all employers.
- Payroll address, phone #, fax # and contact person.
- Proof of medical coverage.
- Any other documentation relevant to your case and the issue of contempt as stated in the petition.

Respondent, BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, is found in contempt and is ordered and directed as follows:

Respondent shall pay a lump sum payment* of:

Respondent shall pay per terms of the modified support order.


*All lump sum payments must be by money order, certified check, or cash.

Special Provisions:


Case is continued to a contempt hearing scheduled July 31, 2024, at 1:30pm. Personal service issued in the courtroom. Defendant is directed to remit any remaining amount of support not garnished from his income each month. Defendant is to notify Domestic Relations within 7 days of any change in address or employment.

Effective: March 18, 2024

BY THE COURT:



JUDGE



Date



In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

2023 NOV 21 AM 8:42

DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

ALENE W. REICH) Docket Number: 2021-00333
vs. Plaintiff)
BLAIR J. REICH) PACSES Case Number: 967300735
Defendant) Other State ID Number:

ORDER OF COURT

Recommended Interim Final

AND NOW, this 16TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2023 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED
that the:

- Respondent, BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, is not found to be in contempt.
- case is continued and it is ordered and directed as follows: this case shall be listed for further hearing by this Court on March 18, 2024, at 1:30 PM. Respondent in this case is:

BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH

in courtroom # 7

At the above scheduled proceeding, contempt may be dismissed, new and/or modified purge conditions may be imposed or incarceration recommended for the defendant. If the plaintiff fails to appear, the Court will proceed with the case and enter an appropriate order. **The parties are to remain until dismissed by the Court.**

YOU ARE REQUIRED TO BRING:

- Cash, credit card in your name, cashier/bank check or money order payable to DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION. **Contact your local DRS before the hearing date to verify which of the payment methods listed above are accepted.**
- Most recent pay stubs for any and all employers.
- Payroll address, phone #, fax # and contact person.
- Proof of medical coverage.
- Any other documentation relevant to your case and the issue of contempt as stated in the petition.



Service Type M

Form EN-546 12/16
Worker ID 36753



Respondent, BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, is found in contempt and is

ordered and directed as follows:

Respondent shall pay a lump sum payment* of:

Respondent shall pay per terms of the modified support order.

*All lump sum payments must be by money order, certified check, or cash.

Special Provisions:

Case is continued to a contempt hearing scheduled on March 18, 2024 at 1:30 PM in courtroom # 7. Personal service issued in the courtroom. Income attachment to remain in effect and Defendant is to remit all regular monthly payments in the month that they are due. Defendant is to notify the Domestic Relations Office within 7 days of any change in address and/or employment.

Effective: November 16, 2023

BY THE COURT:

JUDGE

Date



In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

ALENE W. REICH) Docket Number: 2021-00333
vs. Plaintiff)
BLAIR J. REICH) PACSES Case Number: 967300735
Defendant) Other State ID Number:

ORDER OF COURT

Recommended Interim Final

AND NOW, this 5TH DAY OF JUNE, 2023 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED

that the:

- Respondent, BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, is not found to be in contempt.
- case is continued and it is ordered and directed as follows: this case shall be listed for further hearing by this Court on November 16, 2023, at 1:30 PM. Respondent in this case is:

BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH

in courtroom # 7

At the above scheduled proceeding, contempt may be dismissed, new and/or modified purge conditions may be imposed or incarceration recommended for the defendant. If the plaintiff fails to appear, the Court will proceed with the case and enter an appropriate order. **The parties are to remain until dismissed by the Court.**

YOU ARE REQUIRED TO BRING:

- Cash, credit card in your name, cashier/bank check or money order payable to DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION. **Contact your local DRS before the hearing date to verify which of the payment methods listed above are accepted.**
- Most recent pay stubs for any and all employers.
- Payroll address, phone #; fax # and contact person.
- Proof of medical coverage.
- Any other documentation relevant to your case and the issue of contempt as stated in the petition.





Respondent, BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, is found in contempt and is

ordered and directed as follows:

Respondent shall pay a lump sum payment* of:

Respondent shall pay per terms of the modified support order.

*All lump sum payments must be by money order, certified check, or cash.

Special Provisions:

Case is continued to a contempt hearing scheduled on November 16, 2023 at 1:30 PM in courtroom # 7. Personal service issued in the courtroom. Income attachment to remain in effect and Defendant is to remit all regular monthly payments in the month that they are due. If all payments are made in the month due, the November 16, 2023 hearing may be canceled and the case continued for 6 months. If at that time payments continue to be received in the month due, the hearing may be canceled, the petition for contempt may be satisfied and the case may be placed on a monitoring status. Defendant is to notify the Domestic Relations Office within 7 days of any change in address and/or employment.

Effective: June 5, 2023

BY THE COURT:

JUDGE

6/8/23

Date



In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

AND FILED
2023 MAR 16 AM 8:08

DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

ALENE W. REICH

vs.

BLAIR J. REICH

Plaintiff

Defendant

) Docket Number: 2021-00333

) PACSES Case Number: 967300735

) Other State ID Number:

ORDER OF COURT

Recommended Interim Final

AND NOW, this 15TH DAY OF MARCH, 2023 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED**

that the:

- Respondent, BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, is not found to be in contempt.
- case is continued and it is ordered and directed as follows: this case shall be listed for further hearing by this Court on June 5, 2023, at 1:30pm. Respondent in this case is:

BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH

At the above scheduled proceeding, contempt may be dismissed, new and/or modified purge conditions may be imposed or incarceration recommended for the defendant. If the plaintiff fails to appear, the Court will proceed with the case and enter an appropriate order. **The parties are to remain until dismissed by the Court.**

YOU ARE REQUIRED TO BRING:

- Cash, credit card in your name, cashier/bank check or money order payable to DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION. **Contact your local DRS before the hearing date to verify which of the payment methods listed above are accepted.**
- Most recent pay stubs for any and all employers.
- Payroll address, phone #, fax # and contact person.
- Proof of medical coverage.
- Any other documentation relevant to your case and the issue of contempt as stated in the petition.



Service Type M

Form EN-546 12/16

Worker ID 36456





Respondent, BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, is found in contempt and is

ordered and directed as follows:

Respondent shall pay a lump sum payment* of:

Respondent shall pay per terms of the modified support order.

***All lump sum payments must be by money order, certified check, or cash.**

Special Provisions:

The support contempt hearing scheduled for March 20, 2023 is canceled. Case is continued to a contempt hearing scheduled June 5, 2023 at 1:30pm in Courtroom #7 of the Lancaster County Courthouse. Pursuant to Order dated September 26, 2022 the contempt hearing is to be rescheduled one to two months after the scheduled modification hearing. Modification hearing is currently scheduled for April 18, 2023 at 9:00am. Defendant to notify Domestic Relations Section within 7 days of any changes in address and/or employment.

Effective: March 15, 2023

BY THE COURT:

Per Curiam

JUDGE

3/15/23

Date



IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA
CIVIL ACTION – LAW

ALENE REICH,
Plaintiff

v.

BLAIR J. REICH,
Defendant

:
:
:
:
:
:
:

PACSES No. 967300735

ORDER

AND NOW, this 29th day of November 2022, it is hereby ORDERED that the Support Contempt hearing scheduled for December 12, 2022, at 1:30 p.m. shall be continued to March 20, 2023 at 1:30 p.m. in Courtroom No. 7 of the Lancaster County Courthouse before The Honorable Christopher A. Hackman, Judge.

BY THE COURT:



CHRISTOPHER A. HACKMAN, JUDGE

Attest:

Copies to:

Wendy Chan, Esquire, counsel for Plaintiff
Sandra Edwards Gray, Esquire, counsel for Defendant
Domestic Relations

RECEIVED AND FILED
2022 NOV 30 PM 10:00
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

RECORDED AND FILED

2022 OCT 25 AM 8:04

DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION



ALENE W. REICH

vs.

BLAIR J. REICH

Plaintiff

Defendant

) Docket Number: 2021-00333

)

) PACSES Case Number: 967300735

)

) Other State ID Number:

Order

AND NOW to wit, this OCTOBER 24, 2022 it is hereby Ordered that:

At a Complex Special listed hearing held on October 21, 2022 the court issued the following. The appeal *filed* by defendant's attorney on May 10, 2022 is continued to two half-day Complex Special listing hearings to be held December 9, 2022 at 1:30 PM and December 15, 2022 at 9 AM. Attorneys are to conduct a conference call with defendant's accountant to have their questions answered by accountant prior to the hearing. They are to provide Letter Briefs to Judge, if they deem appropriate, with sufficient time for review prior to hearing. Enforcement is suspended on case by order of the court. The contempt hearing scheduled for December 12, 2022 is cancelled. The contempt petition filed June 14, 2021 is to be addressed after the appeal matter is concluded. Defendant's frozen bank accounts are to be released,

BY THE COURT:

OCTOBER 24, 2022

Date

JUDGE



Service Type M

Form OE-001 12/16

Worker ID 36551

In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

ALENE W. REICH) Docket Number: 2021-00333
vs. Plaintiff)
BLAIR J. REICH) PACSES Case Number: 967300735
Defendant) Other State ID Number:

ORDER OF COURT

Recommended Interim Final

AND NOW, this 21ST DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2021 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED
that the:

- Respondent, BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, is not found to be in contempt.
- case is continued and it is ordered and directed as follows: this case shall be listed for further hearing by this Court on December 2, 2021, at 1:30pm. Respondent in this case is:

BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH

Hearing to be held in Courtroom #7

At the above scheduled proceeding, contempt may be dismissed, new and/or modified purge conditions may be imposed or incarceration recommended for the defendant. If the plaintiff fails to appear, the Court will proceed with the case and enter an appropriate order. **The parties are to remain until dismissed by the Court.**

YOU ARE REQUIRED TO BRING:

- Cash, credit card in your name, cashier/bank check or money order payable to DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION. **Contact your local DRS before the hearing date to verify which of the payment methods listed above are accepted.**
- Most recent pay stubs for any and all employers.
- Payroll address, phone #, fax # and contact person.
- Proof of medical coverage.
- Any other documentation relevant to your case and the issue of contempt as stated in the petition.

ENTERED AND FILED
2021 SEP 23 AM 11:03
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION



Service Type M

Form EN-546 12/16
Worker ID 36456



In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

ENTERED AND FILED

2021 AUG -4 AM 10: 31

ALENE W. REICH DOMESTIC RELATIONS) Docket Number: 2021-00333
vs. Plaintiff)
BLAIR J. REICH) PACSES Case Number: 967300735
Defendant) Other State ID Number:

ORDER OF COURT

Recommended Interim Final

AND NOW, this 2ND DAY OF AUGUST, 2021 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED

that the:

- Respondent, BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, is not found to be in contempt.
- case is continued and it is ordered and directed as follows: this case shall be listed for further hearing by this Court on _____, at _____

Respondent in this case is:
BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH

~~ENTERED AND FILED
2021 AUG -2 PM 10: 00
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION~~

At the above scheduled proceeding, contempt may be dismissed, new and/or modified purge conditions may be imposed or incarceration recommended for the defendant. If the plaintiff fails to appear, the Court will proceed with the case and enter an appropriate order. **The parties are to remain until dismissed by the Court.**

YOU ARE REQUIRED TO BRING:

- Cash, credit card in your name, cashier/bank check or money order payable to DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION. **Contact your local DRS before the hearing date to verify which of the payment methods listed above are accepted.**
- Most recent pay stubs for any and all employers.
- Payroll address, phone #, fax # and contact person.
- Proof of medical coverage.
- Any other documentation relevant to your case and the issue of contempt as stated in the petition.

Service Type M

Form EN-546 12/16
Worker ID 36552

Special Provisions:

Petition for Contempt is continued to a hearing on August 2, 2021 at 1:30 p.m. in courtroom #7. Defendant's notice to be sent regular mail. Personal service to be attempted. Defendant is to remit all regular payment in the month due. Defendant is to report to DRS within 7 days any change in address or employment.

BY THE COURT:

Per Curiam

JUDGE

July 7, 2021

Date



In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

ALENE W. REICH

vs.

BLAIR J. REICH

Plaintiff

Defendant

) Docket Number: 2021-00333

) PACSES Case Number: 967300735

) Other State ID Number:

ORDER OF COURT

Recommended Interim Final

AND NOW, this 7TH DAY OF JULY, 2021 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED

that the:

- Respondent, BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, is not found to be in contempt.
- case is continued and it is ordered and directed as follows: this case shall be listed for further hearing by this Court on August 2, 2021, at 1:30p.m.
Respondent in this case is:

BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH

Hearing to be held in courtroom #7.

- Respondent, BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, is found in contempt and is ordered and directed as follows:

- Respondent shall pay a lump sum payment* of:
- Respondent shall pay per terms of the modified support order.

*All lump sum payments must be by money order, certified check, or cash


ENTERED AND FILED
2021 JUL -7 PM 2:54
DOMESTIC RELATIONS

If this order was issued without agreement of the parties, any party may, within twenty (20) days, file a written demand with the Domestic Relations Section for a hearing before the court.



Service Type M

Form EN-557 12/16
Worker ID 36451



In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION



ALENE W. REICH
vs.
BLAIR J. REICH

Plaintiff
Defendant

) Docket Number: 2021-00333
)
) PACSES Case Number: 967300735
)
) Other State ID Number:

Order

AND NOW to wit, this JUNE 15, 2021 it is hereby Ordered that:

After a hearing having been held on June 14, 2021, the demand for hearing filed by Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich on May 12, 2021, is dismissed by reason: Defendant failed to appear and prosecute. Recommended Order dated May 3, 2021 is ratified and confirmed and is a final order. The court is in receipt of the "Affidavits" filed by the Defendant on June 11, 2021. To the extent these Affidavits require a response from the court, they are denied.

ENTERED AND FILED
2021 JUN 16 PM 3:41
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION



BY THE COURT:

JUNE 15, 2021

Date

JUDGE



Service Type M

Form OE-001 12/16
Worker ID 36451

In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

ALENE W. REICH

Plaintiff

vs.

BLAIR J. REICH

Defendant

) Order Number: 2021-0333
) PACSES Case Number: 967300735
) Docket Number: 2021-00333
) Other State ID Number:

ORDER OF COURT - UNALLOCATED

Final Interim Modified

AND NOW, 16th DAY OF APRIL, 2024, based upon the Court's determination that the Payee's monthly net income is \$4,818.04 and the Payor's monthly net income is \$12,350.29, it is hereby ordered that the Payor pay to the Pennsylvania State Collection and Disbursement Unit Three-Thousand One-Hundred Sixteen and 82/100 Dollars (\$3,116.82) a month payable MONTHLY as follows: first payment due immediately in the amount of \$2,806.82 current support and \$310.00 on arrears. The effective date of the order is 11/21/23.

Arrears set at \$34,732.23 as of APRIL 15, 2024 are due in full IMMEDIATELY. All terms of this Order are subject to collection and/or enforcement by contempt proceedings, credit bureau reporting, tax refund offset certification, passport denial certification, driver's/professional/recreational license revocation, interception of lottery winnings, and the freeze and seize of financial assets. These enforcement/collection mechanisms will not be initiated as long as obligor does not owe overdue support. Failure to make each payment on time and in full will cause all arrears to become subject to immediate collection by all the means listed above.

For the Support of:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Birth Date</u>
ALENE WILMOTH REICH (APL)	05/01/81
ISABELLA MARIE REICH	03/16/10
EVELYN JOSEPHINE REICH	05/08/12
JULIUS FIRE REICH	12/02/18

DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

2024 APR 17 AM 8:43

FILED AND SERVED

Service Type M

Form OE-519 06/17
Worker ID 36153



The defendant owes a total of \$3,116.82 per month payable MONTHLY; \$2,806.82 for current support and \$310.00 for arrears. The defendant must also pay fees/costs as indicated below.

Said money to be turned over by the Pa SCDU for distribution and disbursement in accordance with Rule 1910.17(d).

Payments must be made by check or money order. All checks and money orders must be made payable to Pa SCDU and mailed to:

Pa SCDU
P.O. Box 69110
Harrisburg, Pa 17106-9110

Payments must include the defendant's PACSES Member Number or Social Security Number in order to be processed. Do not send cash by mail.

The monthly support obligation includes cash medical support in the amount of \$250 annually for unreimbursed medical expenses incurred for each child and/or spouse as ordered herein. Unreimbursed medical expenses of the obligee or children that exceed \$250 annually shall be allocated between the parties. The party seeking allocation of unreimbursed medical expenses must provide documentation of expenses to the other party no later than March 31st of the year following the calendar year in which the final medical bill to be allocated was received. The unreimbursed medical expenses are to be paid as follows: 65.00% by defendant and 35.00% by plaintiff.

Defendant is ordered to provide medical insurance coverage.

Within thirty (30) days after the entry of this order, the Plaintiff Defendant shall submit to the other party and to the Domestic Relations Section written proof that medical insurance coverage has been obtained or that application for coverage has been made. Proof of coverage shall consist, at a minimum, of : 1) the name of the health care coverage provider(s); 2) any applicable identification numbers; 3) any cards evidencing coverage; 4) the address to which claims should be made; 5) a description of any restrictions on usage, such as prior approval for hospital admissions, and the manner of obtaining approval; 6) a copy of the benefit booklet or coverage contract; 7) a description of all deductibles and co-payments; and 8) five copies of any claim forms.



Other Conditions:

Order considers parties' 50/50 shared custody arrangement for the children.

Order considers Defendant's obligation to his additional child.

Order considers Plaintiff's child care costs for the children.

Support Order represents a downward deviation of \$300.00 per month from the guideline support amount of \$3,106.82 per month in consideration of the private school tuition being paid by the Defendant.

Effective June 1, 2024, Defendant is to pay \$3,106.82 per month in APL for the Plaintiff and support for parties' 3 children. By reason: Order no longer considers a deviation for Defendant's payment of private school tuition. Order is to continue in effect in all other respects.

Defendant shall pay the following fees:

<u>Fee Total</u>		<u>Fee Description</u>	<u>Payment Frequency</u>	
\$	for		Payable at \$	per
\$	for		Payable at \$	per
\$	for		Payable at \$	per
\$	for		Payable at \$	per
\$	for		Payable at \$	per



IMPORTANT LEGAL NOTICE

PARTIES MUST WITHIN SEVEN DAYS INFORM THE DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION AND THE OTHER PARTIES, IN WRITING, OF ANY MATERIAL CHANGE IN CIRCUMSTANCES RELEVANT TO THE LEVEL OF SUPPORT OR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SUPPORT ORDER, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, LOSS OR CHANGE OF INCOME OR EMPLOYMENT AND CHANGE OF PERSONAL ADDRESS OR CHANGE OF ADDRESS OF ANY CHILD RECEIVING SUPPORT. A PARTY WHO WILLFULLY FAILS TO REPORT A MATERIAL CHANGE IN CIRCUMSTANCES MAY BE ADJUDGED IN CONTEMPT OF COURT, AND MAY BE FINED OR IMPRISONED.

PENNSYLVANIA LAW PROVIDES THAT ALL SUPPORT ORDERS SHALL BE REVIEWED AT LEAST ONCE EVERY THREE (3) YEARS IF SUCH REVIEW IS REQUESTED BY ONE OF THE PARTIES. IF YOU WISH TO REQUEST A REVIEW AND ADJUSTMENT OF YOUR ORDER, YOU MUST DO THE FOLLOWING: CALL YOUR ATTORNEY. AN UNREPRESENTED PERSON WHO WANTS TO MODIFY (ADJUST) A SUPPORT ORDER SHOULD CONTACT THE DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION.

ALL CHARGING ORDERS FOR SPOUSAL SUPPORT AND ALIMONY PENDENTE LITE, INCLUDING UNALLOCATED ORDERS FOR CHILD AND SPOUSAL SUPPORT OR CHILD SUPPORT AND ALIMONY PENDENTE LITE, SHALL TERMINATE UPON DEATH OF THE PAYEE.

A MANDATORY INCOME ATTACHMENT WILL ISSUE UNLESS THE DEFENDANT IS NOT IN ARREARS IN PAYMENT IN AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO OR GREATER THAN ONE MONTH'S SUPPORT OBLIGATION AND (1) THE COURT FINDS THAT THERE IS GOOD CAUSE NOT TO REQUIRE IMMEDIATE INCOME WITHHOLDING; OR (2) A WRITTEN AGREEMENT IS REACHED BETWEEN THE PARTIES WHICH PROVIDES FOR AN ALTERNATE ARRANGEMENT.

UNPAID ARREARAGE BALANCES MAY BE REPORTED TO CREDIT AGENCIES. ON AND AFTER THE DATE IT IS DUE, EACH UNPAID SUPPORT PAYMENT SHALL CONSTITUTE, BY OPERATION OF LAW, A JUDGMENT AGAINST YOU, AS WELL AS A LIEN AGAINST REAL PROPERTY.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, upon payor's failure to comply with this order, payor may be arrested and brought before the Court for a Contempt hearing; payor's wages, salary, commissions, and/or income may be attached in accordance with law; this Order will be increased without further hearing by 20% per month until all arrearages are paid in full. Payor is responsible for court costs and fees.

Copies delivered to parties : _____
Date

Consented:

Plaintiff

Plaintiff's Attorney

Defendant

Defendant's Attorney

BY THE COURT:

16th DAY OF APRIL, 2024

Date



Judge



In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania

DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

PO BOX 83479, LANCASTER, PA. 17608-3479

Phone: (717) 299-8141

JANUARY 24, 2025

Fax: (717) 293-7270



BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH
227 CHERRY ST
COLUMBIA PA 17512-1409

Plaintiff Name: ALENE W. REICH
Defendant Name: BLAIR J. REICH
Defendant SSN: .3788
Docket Number: 2021-00333
PACSES Case Number: 967300735
Member ID Number: 2420300093
Order Number: 2021-0333
Account Number: 5
Financial Institution: BANK

Please note: All correspondence must include the PACSES Case Number.

NOTICE OF FREEZING/SEIZING OF ASSETS

Dear BLAIR J. REICH

As required by Federal Law, 42 U.S.C. Section 666, and State Law, 23 Pa. C.S. § 4304.1(b.1), computer data matches are conducted between all obligors who owe overdue support and financial institutions. This match has identified you as owing overdue support arrears and owning an asset or assets held by a financial institution. As a result of the overdue support that you owe, in accordance with PA RCP 1910.23, an order freezing your asset(s) has been entered by the court and served upon the financial institution holding that asset or assets. The amount of your arrears is \$31,611.95 as of JANUARY 24, 2025. Once the arrears have been paid, an Order to release the remaining asset(s) will be sent to the financial institution to terminate the freeze of asset or assets.

NOTE: 31 CFR Part 212 allows for the garnishment of protected federal benefits.

You have a right to contest this Notice within thirty (30) days of the date appearing on this Notice. Your contest is limited to the following: (1) no overdue support exists; (2) there is a mistake in the amount of overdue support; (3) there is a mistake in the identity of the obligor; or (4) the account is not subject to attachment as a matter of law. Contact the DRS listed above for instructions on how to contest this notice. The objections must be received within the thirty (30) day period. If you do not contest this notice within (30) days of the date of this notice or pay your arrears balance in full, the entire asset(s) up to the amount stated above will be seized from your account and applied to your support case(s).

Sincerely,

TEAM 3 - M-R

Service Type M

Form EN-502 12/20

Worker ID \$GAM

In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania

DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

PO BOX 83479, LANCASTER, PA. 17608-3479

Phone: (717) 299-8141

JANUARY 17, 2025

Fax: (717) 293-7270



BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH
227 CHERRY ST
COLUMBIA PA 17512-1409

Plaintiff Name: ALENE W. REICH
Defendant Name: BLAIR J. REICH
Defendant SSN: _____ 13788
Docket Number: 2021-00333
PACSES Case Number: 967300735
Member ID Number: 2420300093
Order Number: 2021-0333
Account Number: _____ 91-3
Financial Institution: _____ CREDIT UNION

Please note: All correspondence must include the PACSES Case Number.

NOTICE OF FREEZING/SEIZING OF ASSETS

Dear BLAIR J. REICH

As required by Federal Law, 42 U.S.C. Section 666, and State Law, 23 Pa. C.S. § 4304.1(b.1), computer data matches are conducted between all obligors who owe overdue support and financial institutions. This match has identified you as owing overdue support arrears and owning an asset or assets held by a financial institution. As a result of the overdue support that you owe, in accordance with PA RCP 1910.23, an order freezing your asset(s) has been entered by the court and served upon the financial institution holding that asset or assets. The amount of your arrears is \$32,307.07 as of JANUARY 17, 2025. Once the arrears have been paid, an Order to release the remaining asset(s) will be sent to the financial institution to terminate the freeze of asset or assets.

NOTE: 31 CFR Part 212 allows for the garnishment of protected federal benefits.

You have a right to contest this Notice within thirty (30) days of the date appearing on this Notice. Your contest is limited to the following: (1) no overdue support exists; (2) there is a mistake in the amount of overdue support; (3) there is a mistake in the identity of the obligor; or (4) the account is not subject to attachment as a matter of law. Contact the DRS listed above for instructions on how to contest this notice. The objections must be received within the thirty (30) day period. If you do not contest this notice within (30) days of the date of this notice or pay your arrears balance in full, the entire asset(s) up to the amount stated above will be seized from your account and applied to your support case(s).

Sincerely,

TEAM 3 M-R



Service Type M

Form EN-502 12/20

Worker ID \$GAM

In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION



BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH
227 CHERRY ST
COLUMBIA PA 17512-1409

ALENE W. REICH

vs.

BLAIR J. REICH

Plaintiff

Defendant

) Docket Number: 2021-00333
)
) PACSES Case Number: 967300735
)
) Other State ID Number:

Notice of Decision

Dear BLAIR J. REICH

On OCTOBER 2, 2025 the Domestic Relations Section of the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County took the following action upon the objections to the Proposed Action,

- 1. The objections are sustained and the proposed action shall not be initiated.
- 2. The objections are sustained and the proposed action shall be modified as follows:
- 3. The objections are dismissed and the proposed action shall be initiated for the following reasons:
 - Objections raised are not warranted under Federal Law, 42 USC Section 666 and State Law, 23 PS CS 4304.1(b-1)

Sincerely,

TEAM 3 M-R



Service Type M

Form EN-010 09/17
Worker ID 36550



blair of columbia // reich: blair-jesse-ellyn // aggroed lighthacker
two hundred and twenty seven columbia, lancaster county, pennsylvania (republic)
blairjessellynreich@gmail.com
979-574-1577
man, pennsylvania national, We the People, sui juris,

ON BEHALF OF:
BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH
227 CHERRY STREET
COLUMBIA, PA 17512
LEGAL NULLITY, *ENS LEGIS*, US CITIZEN, PERSON, SOLE PROPRIETOR, UCC 9
REGISTERED ORGANIZATION

November 7th, Anno Domini two thousand and twenty-five, and of the Independence of
the united States of America two hundred and forty-nine.

IN THE LEGALLY REPUGNANT SIMULATION OF LAW MASQUARADING AS THE
"COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION" OPERATING BY WAY OF LEX INJUSTA,
RACKETEERING, HUMAN TRAFFICKING, AND TREASON & WITHOUT FORCE OF
LAW WHILE JUDICIALLY ULTRA VIRES FOR ILL PURPOSE

ALENE REICH	:	
Plaintiff	:	CI-2021-0333
	:	PACSES 96730073
	:	
V.	:	
	:	
	:	JUDICIAL NOTICE OF AFFIRMATION
	:	OF FEDERAL SUPREMACY
	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	
BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH	:	
DEFENDANT	:	

**JUDICIAL NOTICE OF AFFIRMATION OF FEDERAL SUPREMACY AND
CONTRAVENTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES AND PREREQUISITES**

AND NOW, TO WIT, this 7th day of November, 2025, comes the alleged Defendant, BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH (hereinafter BJER), by its living agent, blair of columbia (hereinafter I, me, father, husband, dad, blair of columbia, aggy, Affiant, Jester of Jurisprudence, Sultan of Snide, Sovereign of Snark, and Reverend of Irreverence) and he files this JUDICIAL NOTICE OF AFFIRMATION OF FEDERAL SUPREMACY AND CONTRAVENTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES AND PREREQUISITES pursuant to the United States Constitution, Article VI, Clause 2 (Supremacy Clause), which unambiguously declares that the Constitution, federal statutes, and treaties are the Supreme Law of the Land, subordinate only to the Constitution itself, as affirmed in Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803).

Coram non jure, the Court's repeated violations of the Fourteenth Amendment—specifically, due process and equal protection—contravene their constitutional mandates as settled law by Turner v. Rogers, 564 U.S. 431 (2011), Santosky v. Kramer, 455 U.S. 745 (1982), and Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57 (2000). The Court's acts of usurpation, deviation from statutory requirements, and egregious breaches of fundamental rights constitute a clear breach of federal supremacy, statutory law, and constitutional protections.

This submission preserves all rights under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1988, 28 U.S.C. § 1443, and 18 U.S.C. §§ 1581 et seq., and challenges the legitimacy of any and all orders, both statutory and judicial, derived from unconstitutionally obtained mandates. The Court's jurisdiction to act here is subordinate to the federal supremacy mandated by the U.S. Constitution, the Pennsylvania Constitution, and binding case law.

ALLEGED BACKGROUND

1. On November 7, 2025, a support conference was conducted involving Blair Reich, Alene Wilmoth reich (Wife), her attorney Wendy Chan (Wendy), and DRS Conference Officer Kelly May (Kelly). This conference concerned financial arrangements relating to child support, which, upon further scrutiny, reveal conditions and practices indicative of a criminal enterprise operated under the guise of lawful adjudication—an enterprise involving racketeering, human trafficking, and treasonous acts perpetrated by a judiciary cartel operating within the Lancaster County Domestic Relations Section.
2. This Court's repeated issuance of unlawful orders, issued under the guise of per curiam decisions and judicial fiat, violate the core constitutional protections of Due Process (Fourteenth Amendment), including the fundamental rights to neutrality in arbitration, notice, and a fair hearing. These acts—deliberate or

negligent—constitute high crimes of treason and sedition, as defined under the Constitution and applicable case law.

3. The Court's pattern of operating as a de facto tribunal committed to maximizing federalized revenue—particularly through Title IV-D funds—violates the constitutional prohibition of collusion with federal agencies and agencies of the State engaged in racketeering and human trafficking, as outlined in *United States v. McNally*, 483 U.S. 350 (1987), and *Glen Uganda Cases* (Papua New Guinea).
4. Every order must be subject to the strict scrutiny mandated by the Pennsylvania Constitution, and cannot be justified by statutory or local rules that are subordinate to the federal Constitution. This Court must uphold the principles of federalism, as delineated in *Printz v. United States*, 521 U.S. 898 (1997), and oppose all efforts to undermine the sovereignty of the federal government, especially where such efforts impede constitutional rights protected under the Bill of Rights and the Fourteenth Amendment.

AFFIRMATION OF FEDERAL SUPREMACY

5. The Supremacy Clause affirms that the federal Constitution—and its amendments—are the overarching law, and all state or local laws or practices that attempt to subvert or override this federal supremacy are null and void. Any local law or Court order that violates this paramount principle, including rulings predicated on unconstitutional procedures or prejudicial biases designed to facilitate federal money laundering and racketeering, will be challenged and invalidated.
6. The Fourteenth Amendment explicitly prohibits any state action that deprives persons of liberty, property, or due process. This Court's actions, which deny a fair, meaningful hearing, impose confiscatory support orders, and facilitate interstate human trafficking—are in direct violation of this constitutional prohibition.
7. This court is constitutionally required to follow Federal Supremacy, but is also contractually bound to Affirm Federal Supremacy pursuant to Section 9 on Page 37 of the COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT between LANCASTER COUNTY, LANCASTER CCP, LANCASTER DRS, and PADHS.
8. Alleged Defendant is a stickler for Due Notice, and thus offers to Conference Officer Kelly May and treasonous despot WPM notice of expectations regarding compliance with Federal Supremacy.

REQUIREMENTS OF FEDERAL SUPREMACY

9. Federal Supremacy is defined under the Supremacy Clause and states that the Federal Constitution and its enactments are the Supreme Law.
 - a. State statute, DRS practices and customs, and judicial whim leading to treason are all subservient to the Federal Constitution, US Supreme Court, US Supreme Court Case Law, Pennsylvania Supreme Court Case Law, Pennsylvania Superior Court Case Law, Laws of Civil Procedure, and Local Rules.
 - b. Municipal Judges are not empowered to do whatever they like whenever they like to effectuate human trafficking and racketeering so they can launder Federal Funds.
10. One aspect of Federal Supremacy, but not the only aspect of Federal Supremacy is the 14th Amendment which restricts states from depriving persons of Due Process of Law and Equal Protection under the Law.
11. Due Process has a variety of pre-requisites
 - a. Neutral Arbitration
 - b. Due Notice
 - c. Substantive and Procedural Due Process of Law
 - d. Equal Protection under the Law
12. Alleged Defendant is concerned that none of those aspects of Federal Supremacy have been in the case to date especially as the Court has been operating as a simulation of law, but actually under the control of a judicial cartel operating a human trafficking and racketeering operation by way of daily acts of treason.
 - a. This is especially meaningful towards 11(a) where it seems impossible to achieve Neutral Arbitration when the Court is working to achieve maximum Federal Money Laundering and Wire Fraud by way of Title IV-D funds rather than properly abducting the dispute under Federal Supremacy.
 - b. Due Notice requires a meaningful hearing at a meaningful time, and this too seems an impossibility given that the court asymmetrically adjudicates in favor of the outcome that maximizes interstate laundering and theft of

Title IV-D funds instead of providing a meaningful hearing for litigants in family law.

13. Regarding Substantive Due Process of Law this litigant is preserving state and federal substantive rights-

a. Federal Rights and Fundamental Liberties

- i. Right to Justice and Fundamental Fairness under the 14th Amendment
- ii. Right to Care Custody and Control my children
- iii. Right to acquire, Possess, and Protect Property
- iv. Have a limit of 50-60% of income based dependant on a variety of factors

b. State Rights and Fundamental Liberties

- i. PA Case law is clear that litigants in Pennsylvania have the following substantive rights that block Support Orders from
 1. Being confiscatory
 2. Being Oppressive
 3. Disallowing for normal expenses
 4. Disallowing dignity of Life

14. If the state is attempting to abridge my substantive rights and fundamental liberties it has to enact a Mathews Balancing Test and determine the liberties impacted and the nature of those liberties.

15. If the Mathews Balancing Test finds that any aspect of the new Support Order might burden or abridge my fundamental rights and liberties then it has to enact procedural safeguards to ensure that no erroneous deprivation of my rights occurs.

a. Those procedural Due Process safeguards includes but is not limited to

- i. Presumptions
- ii. Burden of Proof
- iii. Standard of Proof

- iv. Evidence Standard
- v. State Interest
- vi. Strict Scrutiny
 - 1. Compelling State Interest
 - 2. Narrowly Tailored
 - 3. Least Restrictive Means

CONSISTENT FAILURE OF FEDERAL SUPREMACY AND ILLEGAL ENTERPRISE, RACKETEERING, AND SEDITION

16. This Court's operation is, on its face, a criminal enterprise, involving acts of treason against the Constitution—particularly the violation of the Supremacy Clause (*Marbury v. Madison*, *supra*)—by colluding with federal funds looters and human traffickers operating under color of law. These acts constitute racketeering under the RICO statute (18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968), and may give rise to serious criminal liability for those involved, including judges, court officials, and supporting agencies.
17. Any order issued, knowingly or negligently, which contravenes federal constitutional mandates, shall be considered part of this criminal enterprise and will be subject to immediate federal review and challenge, including removal to the United States District Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1443.
18. Any Support Order issued by this simulation of law operated by a treasonous cartel of judges, elected officials and appointed officials will be met with strong resistance composed of Federal Complaints and legal remedies.
19. This notice is not intended in any way to abridge your legal and lawful right to adjudicate matters lawfully and legally under Federal Supremacy, but to inform you that if you abridge this litigant's rights and liberties without constitutional consideration inherent to Federal Supremacy expect unlimited legal resistance and escalation.
20. If you cause me further irreparable harm despite this notification you can safely assume you'll be tagged at a minimum as a co-conspirator to this enterprise and may find yourself directly accused of treason, sedition, and other high crimes.
21. In any forthcoming Support Order please address not only state statutory constraints but also constitutional considerations under Federal Supremacy and particularly those listed above.

NOTICE OF FEDERAL PRESERVATION

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1443, Defendant reserves the right to remove this action to federal district court for protection of civil rights, and provides notice that any proceeding inconsistent with Turner v. Rogers or federal funding conditions may result in injunctive and declaratory relief in U.S. District Court.

In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION

ALENE W. REICH

Plaintiff

vs.

BLAIR J. REICH

Defendant

) Order Number: 2021-0333

) PACSES Case Number: 967300735

) Docket Number: 2021-00333

) Other State ID Number: ENTERED AND FILED

ORDER OF COURT - UNALLOCATED

Final Interim Modified

DEC 02 2025

LANCASTER COUNTY
DOMESTIC RELATIONS

AND NOW, 17TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2025, based upon the Court's determination that the Payee's monthly net income is \$4,972.81 and the Payor's monthly net income is \$12,373.74, it is hereby ordered that the Payor pay to the Pennsylvania State Collection and Disbursement Unit Four Thousand Seven Hundred Forty-Five and 58/100 Dollars (\$4,745.58) a month payable monthly as follows: first payment due immediately in the amount of \$4,315.58 current support + \$430 on arrears. The effective date of the order is 06/25/25.

Arrears set at \$49,936.65 as of NOVEMBER 17, 2025 are due in full IMMEDIATELY. All terms of this Order are subject to collection and/or enforcement by contempt proceedings, credit bureau reporting, tax refund offset certification, passport denial certification, driver's/professional/recreational license revocation, interception of lottery winnings, and the freeze and seize of financial assets. These enforcement/collection mechanisms will not be initiated as long as obligor does not owe overdue support. Failure to make each payment on time and in full will cause all arrears to become subject to immediate collection by all the means listed above.

For the Support of:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Birth Date</u>
ALENE WILMOTH REICH (APL)	05/01/81
_____ CH	/10
_____ REICH	'12
_____ REICH	/18



The defendant owes a total of \$4,745.58 per month payable monthly; \$4,315.58 for current support and \$430.00 for arrears. The defendant must also pay fees/costs as indicated below.

Said money to be turned over by the Pa SCDU for distribution and disbursement in accordance with Rule 1910.17(d).

Payments must be made by check or money order. All checks and money orders must be made payable to Pa SCDU and mailed to:

Pa SCDU
P.O. Box 69110
Harrisburg, Pa 17106-9110

Payments must include the defendant's PACSES Member Number or Social Security Number in order to be processed. Do not send cash by mail.

The monthly support obligation includes cash medical support in the amount of \$250 annually for unreimbursed medical expenses incurred for each child and/or spouse as ordered herein. Unreimbursed medical expenses of the obligee or children that exceed \$250 annually shall be allocated between the parties. The party seeking allocation of unreimbursed medical expenses must provide documentation of expenses to the other party no later than March 31st of the year following the calendar year in which the final medical bill to be allocated was received. The unreimbursed medical expenses are to be paid as follows: 65.00% by defendant and 35.00% by plaintiff.

Plaintiff is ordered to provide medical insurance coverage.

Within thirty (30) days after the entry of this order, the Plaintiff Defendant shall submit to the other party and to the Domestic Relations Section written proof that medical insurance coverage has been obtained or that application for coverage has been made. Proof of coverage shall consist, at a minimum, of : 1) the name of the health care coverage provider(s); 2) any applicable identification numbers; 3) any cards evidencing coverage; 4) the address to which claims should be made; 5) a description of any restrictions on usage, such as prior approval for hospital admissions, and the manner of obtaining approval; 6) a copy of the benefit booklet or coverage contract; 7) a description of all deductibles and co-payments; and 8) five copies of any claim forms.



IMPORTANT LEGAL NOTICE

PARTIES MUST WITHIN SEVEN DAYS INFORM THE DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION AND THE OTHER PARTIES, IN WRITING, OF ANY MATERIAL CHANGE IN CIRCUMSTANCES RELEVANT TO THE LEVEL OF SUPPORT OR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SUPPORT ORDER, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, LOSS OR CHANGE OF INCOME OR EMPLOYMENT AND CHANGE OF PERSONAL ADDRESS OR CHANGE OF ADDRESS OF ANY CHILD RECEIVING SUPPORT. A PARTY WHO WILLFULLY FAILS TO REPORT A MATERIAL CHANGE IN CIRCUMSTANCES MAY BE ADJUDGED IN CONTEMPT OF COURT, AND MAY BE FINED OR IMPRISONED.

PENNSYLVANIA LAW PROVIDES THAT ALL SUPPORT ORDERS SHALL BE REVIEWED AT LEAST ONCE EVERY THREE (3) YEARS IF SUCH REVIEW IS REQUESTED BY ONE OF THE PARTIES. IF YOU WISH TO REQUEST A REVIEW AND ADJUSTMENT OF YOUR ORDER, YOU MUST DO THE FOLLOWING: CALL YOUR ATTORNEY. AN UNREPRESENTED PERSON WHO WANTS TO MODIFY (ADJUST) A SUPPORT ORDER SHOULD CONTACT THE DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION.

ALL CHARGING ORDERS FOR SPOUSAL SUPPORT AND ALIMONY PENDENTE LITE, INCLUDING UNALLOCATED ORDERS FOR CHILD AND SPOUSAL SUPPORT OR CHILD SUPPORT AND ALIMONY PENDENTE LITE, SHALL TERMINATE UPON DEATH OF THE PAYEE.

A MANDATORY INCOME ATTACHMENT WILL ISSUE UNLESS THE DEFENDANT IS NOT IN ARREARS IN PAYMENT IN AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO OR GREATER THAN ONE MONTH'S SUPPORT OBLIGATION AND (1) THE COURT FINDS THAT THERE IS GOOD CAUSE NOT TO REQUIRE IMMEDIATE INCOME WITHHOLDING; OR (2) A WRITTEN AGREEMENT IS REACHED BETWEEN THE PARTIES WHICH PROVIDES FOR AN ALTERNATE ARRANGEMENT.

UNPAID ARREARAGE BALANCES MAY BE REPORTED TO CREDIT AGENCIES. ON AND AFTER THE DATE IT IS DUE, EACH UNPAID SUPPORT PAYMENT SHALL CONSTITUTE, BY OPERATION OF LAW, A JUDGMENT AGAINST YOU, AS WELL AS A LIEN AGAINST REAL PROPERTY.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, upon payor's failure to comply with this order, payor may be arrested and brought before the Court for a Contempt hearing; payor's wages, salary, commissions, and/or income may be attached in accordance with law; this Order will be increased without further hearing by 20% a month until all arrearages are paid in full. Payor is responsible for court costs and fees.

Copies delivered to parties : _____
Date

Consented:

Plaintiff

Plaintiff's Attorney

Defendant

Defendant's Attorney

BY THE COURT:

November 28, 2025
Date

W P Mahon

MAHON Senior Judge



In the Court of Common Pleas of LANCASTER County, Pennsylvania
DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION



ALENE W. REICH

vs.

BLAIR J. REICH

Plaintiff

Defendant

) Docket Number: 2021-00333
)
) PACSES Case Number: 967300735
)
) Other State ID Number:

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO REQUEST A HEARING

The parties are hereby advised that they have until DECEMBER 22, 2025 to request a hearing de novo before the Court. File requests at:

DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION
150 N QUEEN ST
SUITE 220
LANCASTER PA 17603

or mail to: DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION
PO BOX 83479
LANCASTER PA 17608-3479



Service Type M

Form OE-572 06/22
Worker ID 36401

28 U.S. CODE §1746 UNSWORN DECLARATIONS UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY

BY: blair of columbia // reich: blair-jesse-ellyn // aggroed lighthacker
two hundred and twenty seven columbia, lancaster county, pennsylvania (republic)
blairjessellynreich@gmail.com
979-574-1577
man, pennsylvania national, We the People, sui juris,

NATIONAL OF THE PENNSYLVANIA REPUBLIC

The autographed affiant and witnesses below, all People of Pennsylvanian who live in the Pennsylvania Republic in the United States of America, hereby request all who it may concern, to permit these sovereign Pennsylvania State Nationals, named herein, to pass without delay or hindrance and in case of need, to give all lawful aid and protection.

Name of Pennsylvania State Nationals:

Reich, Blair-Jesse-Elynn, born 9/18/1979 in Worcester, Massachusetts and father to-
IMR, born 3/16/2010 in Cambridge, Massachusetts
EJR, born 5/8/2012 in Cambridge, Massachusetts
JFR, born 12/2/2018 in Cambridge, Massachusetts

"I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on 7/29/2025."

Further I sayeth naught.

AUTOGRAPH

By: Reich: Blair - Jesse - Elynn, Affiant

By Reich Blair - Jesse - Elynn, Affiant

WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND WITHOUT RECOURSE
Reserving ALL Natural God-Given, Constitutionally protected,
Unalienable Birthrights, Waiving None, Ever,
BY: blair of columbia // reich: blair-jesse-ellyn, free White Pennsylvanian

Subscribed and Sworn to Before me

This 29 Day of JULY, 2025

By *Corrine Faircloth*
Notary Public

WITNESSES

Printed Name *Gabriella McCauley*

autograph *Gabriella McCauley*

Printed Name *Kayla Reed*

autograph *Kayla Reed*

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
LANCASTER COUNTY

Signed before me on *07/29/25* (date)

By: *reich: blair-jesse-ellyn, man*

Signature of notarial officer *Corrine Faircloth*

Stamp

Title of Office *Notary Public*

My Commission Expires: *01/12/2028*

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania - Notary Seal
Corrine Faircloth, Notary Public
Lancaster County
My commission expires February 27, 2028
Commission number 1443571
Member, Pennsylvania Association of Notaries

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania - Notary Seal
Derek R. Trone, Notary Public
York County
My Commission Expires January 12, 2028
Commission Number 1168721
Member, Pennsylvania Association of Notaries

Cooperative Agreement

appeal is finally adjudicated. If the penalty or sanction involves an overpayment or reimbursement of federal funds, the matter under appeal will only be stayed until final adjudication within DHS. If DHS shows, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the DRS has caused an imminent risk of either federal disapproval of all or part of Pennsylvania's State Plan or a loss of federal funds by the Commonwealth, the Bureau of Hearings and Appeals may order that the penalty or sanction be implemented pending appeal.

9. Affirmation of Federal Supremacy

All parties affirm that they shall comply with the requirements of Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, implementing federal regulations, and other applicable federal laws and regulations and requirements. The DRS and DHS shall jointly take all steps necessary and appropriate to fulfill this obligation.

10. Term, Amendment, and Cancellation

10.1 Term of Agreement

Subject to the availability of federal funds, this Cooperative Agreement shall be effective October 1, 2015; and shall terminate September 30, 2020.

10.2 Amendments or Waivers

It is agreed that this Cooperative Agreement shall conform to all present State and federal laws and regulations and any future changes in these laws and regulations. All other additions modifications, alterations, or waivers of the provisions of this Cooperative Agreement shall be valid only when they have been reduced to writing and duly executed by all signatories.

10.3 Termination

DHS or the court and county jointly may terminate this Cooperative Agreement on 180 business days' written notice to either party. In addition to the foregoing termination rights, the county and the court shall have an opportunity to terminate this agreement any time the level of FFP under this agreement is reduced. In order to invoke this right of termination, the court and county must jointly notify the DHS in writing of their desire to terminate this agreement. Such notice must be given no later than 30 days after DHS notifies the DRS of any reduction in federal funding. Any notice given later than 30 days shall be ineffective under this provision. Termination under this provision shall occur 180 business days following the date of timely notice of termination to DHS from the county and the court.

10.4 General Terms and Conditions

The general terms and conditions applicable to this Cooperative Agreement are

LLOYD SMUCKER
11TH DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA

WASHINGTON OFFICE
302 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-2411

COMMITTEES
WAYS AND MEANS
BUDGET
EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE



U. S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-3811

LANCASTER OFFICE
2270 EBEL COURT
LANCASTER, PA 17601
(717) 393-0667

RED LION OFFICE
100 BRIDCO AVENUE
RED LION, PA 17356
(717) 969-6133

HANOVER OFFICE
118 CARLISLE STREET
HANOVER, PA 17331
(717) 969-6132

January 6, 2025

Mr. Blair Reich
227 Cherry St
Columbia, PA 17512-1409

Dear Mr. Reich,

This is just a brief note to let you know that I have contacted the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) with regard to your request for information.

As soon as I receive a response from the FBI, I will be certain to get back in touch with you. In the meantime, please be assured of my continued interest on your behalf, as well as my desire to be of all possible assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lloyd Smucker", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Lloyd Smucker
Member of Congress

Section 1.2. This agreement is not intended to, nor does it in any way, enlarge or reduce the jurisdiction of the Court, nor is it intended to, nor does it, in any manner, encroach upon the independence of the judiciary and the determination of the issues of any case in the court.

The remainder of Defendant's incomprehensible arguments are dismissed as meritless and another example of his litigation violence directed against Plaintiff and the courts.