

blair of columbia, two hundred and twenty seven columbia, lancaster county, pennsylvania (republic), blairjessellynreich@gmail.com, 979-574-1577, free white man, pennsylvania national, We the People (singular), 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

February Twenty-Third, Anno Domini two thousand and twenty-six, and of the Independence of the united States of America two hundred and forty-nine.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA (Middle District)

BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH,

Appellant,

v.

ALENE WILMOTH REICH,

Appellee.

Docket Nos.: CI-21-02607 (Custody) / CI-20-06144 (Divorce) / 21-00333 (Support) / PACSES 967300735

EMERGENCY NOTICE OF INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL AS OF RIGHT FROM MULTIPLE ORDERS IN MULTI-MATTER ACTIONS AND APPLICATION FOR EMERGENCY STAY PENDING APPEAL STAVING OFF RETALIATORY HARM

Notice is hereby given that Blair Jesse Ellyn Reich, pro se Appellant, appeals as of right to the Superior Court of Pennsylvania from the interlocutory orders of the Court of Common Pleas of Lancaster County entered February 13, 2026 (two orders in custody and divorce), and February 17, 2026 (one combined order across three matters), which function as injunctions restricting access to courts and denying multiple motions sua sponte without hearings. The instant appeal is a judicially efficient multi-matter appeal consolidating multiple orders across related actions to avoid duplicative filings. These orders are appealable under Pa.R.A.P. 311(a)(4) (injunctions) and 313 (collateral orders). Copies attached as Exhibits A (Feb. 13 Orders) and B (Feb. 17 Order).

An order restricting a party's ability to file or to obtain docket access is an injunction and therefore immediately appealable as of right under Pa.R.A.P. 311(a)(4). Pennsylvania courts permit immediate appellate review of injunctions, and the Superior Court also recognizes that orders denying public access are appealable as collateral orders (Pa.R.A.P. 311(a)(4) && 313; *Chipman v. Avon Grove Sch. Dist.*; *Commonwealth v.*

Selenski). Appellant applies for an emergency stay of all proceedings, including the March 12, 2026 contempt and support hearings, pending appeal resolution, under Pa.R.A.P. 1732 (stay/supersedeas). A supporting memorandum is attached. In support:

I. Jurisdiction and Appealability

This Court has jurisdiction over interlocutory appeals from injunctions (Pa.R.A.P. 311(a)(4) & 313). The orders enjoin filings without need for trial court approval, constituting irreparable harm (*Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347 (1976)). Sua Sponte dismissals also deny Appellant's motions w/o hearings, compounding violations.

II. Statement of Facts

The court's ultra vires actions began after Appellant's December 24, 2025 "Convoluting Federal Supremacy" filing, demanding RTK responses, constitutional question answers/certification, and recusal for constitutional violations. Defaults led to January motions for bifurcation, custody & support modification. Sua sponte denials followed, escalating to prefiling injunctions denying court access and bad faith mocking Appellant. Denials since Dec 24: extensive (attached) and without process. Wage garnishment and custody shift lack Mathews testing. March 12 contempt/support hearings alarm retaliation. Dockets show monthly/responsive filings, not "voluminous."

III. Argument for Emergency Appeal and Stay

1. **Irreparable Harm:** Orders violate federal supremacy (U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2; Title IV-D, 42 U.S.C. §§ 651–669b), separation of powers (creating new law sua sponte), pro se protections (*Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972)), free speech (First Amendment), right to grieve (Pa. Const. Art. I, § 20), and due process (Fourteenth Amendment; *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976)). Sua sponte nature without Appellee's input highlights retaliatory motive. Harm is irreparable (*Roman Catholic Diocese v. Cuomo*, 592 U.S. ____ (2020)).
2. **Likelihood of Success:** Orders lack clear/convincing evidence, narrow tailoring, least restrictive means, compelling state interest (strict scrutiny for fundamental rights). Abuse discretion (*Gati v. Gati*, 263 A.3d 1170 (Pa. Super. 2021)). Multiple denials without hearings void ab initio (*Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137 (1803)). Sua sponte denials/injunction without party request exacerbates overreach.
3. **Public Interest/Balance of Equities:** Stay preserves status quo, prevents further harm; no prejudice to Appellee (who did not request orders). Proceeding risks escalated unconstitutional enforcement and more irreparable harm.
4. **Emergency Need:** March 12 hearings (contempt under 23 Pa.C.S. § 4345 and support review) enforce orders and fabricated arrears; stay required to avoid

mootness (Pa.R.A.P. 1732(a)). Expedite under Pa.R.A.P. 1233 to protect from willful, deliberate, and reckless irreparable harm by Mahon to Appellant.

V. Relief Requested

- This Court must vacate and reverse the February 13 and 17, 2026 orders with prejudice, as void ab initio for constitutional violations and abuse of discretion, restoring Appellant's full filing rights immediately.
- This Court must remand the underlying cases for de novo review of all denied motions since Appellant's December 24, 2025 filing, including reconsiderations of prior unconstitutional orders (e.g., wage garnishment and custody shifts without Mathews balancing), as the sua sponte denials violated due process and federal supremacy, rendering them void ab initio; remand to a new non-seditious judge who actually affirms Federal Supremacy with instructions for evidentiary hearings and strict scrutiny on fundamental rights (Pa.R.A.P. 311(c); Gati v. Gati, 263 A.3d 1170 (Pa. Super. 2021); Fuentes v. Shevin, 407 U.S. 67 (1972)) as Mahon's bias and retaliation for constitutional grieving require disqualification for impartiality.
- This Court must issue a permanent stay and injunction against enforcing the orders, as they cause irreparable harm to fundamental rights, barring further retaliatory unconstitutional restrictions without due process.
- This Court must award Appellant all appellate costs, fees, and damages, including pro se compensation, for vexatious conduct under Pa.R.A.P. 2744 and 42 Pa.C.S. § 2503(9).
- This Court must forward this matter to the Judicial Conduct Board for investigation and discipline, including removal, and to the Pennsylvania Attorney General for criminal review, as the conduct suggests violations of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1343, 1962, 241, 242, 2384, as well as 18 Pa.C.S. §§ 903, 4952, 4953, 5101, 5301 warranting accountability. Forward to PaDHS and Federal HHS regarding compliance audit of State Plan and Cooperative Agreements.
- This Court must grant an emergency stay of all underlying proceedings until appeal resolution, preventing further harm and retaliation under Pa.R.A.P. 1732(a) (preserving status quo); see Commonwealth v. Karash, 518 Pa. 312 (1987). Alternatively, order a continuance of the March 12, 2026 contempt and support hearings at 9:00 AM under Pa.R.C.P. 216 (preventing injustice), as proceeding enforces void orders and violates due process (Fuentes v. Shevin, 407 U.S. 67 (1972)).
- Any other relief this Court deems just (Pa.R.A.P. 123).

Submitted under Duress of March 12, 2026 hearings,

/A/ blair, Agent

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF EMERGENCY APPEAL AND STAY

Epigraph

"When you tear out a man's tongue, you are not proving him a liar, you're only telling the world that you fear what he might say." – Tyrion Lannister, Game of Thrones.

Table of Authorities

United States Constitution

U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2 (Supremacy Clause).
U.S. Const. Amend. I (Free Speech, Right to Petition).
U.S. Const. Amend. V (Due Process Clause, Takings Clause).
U.S. Const. Amend. XIII (Prohibition on Involuntary Servitude).
U.S. Const. Amend. XIV (Due Process Clause, Equal Protection Clause).
U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 3 (Commerce Clause).
U.S. Const. art. III, § 2 (Federal Judicial Power).
U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 3 (Oaths for State Officials).
U.S. Const. art. II, cl. 1 (Oath for Federal Officials).
U.S. Const. art. I, § 10, cl. 1 (Contract Clause).
U.S. Const. Art. III, § 3 (Treason).

Pennsylvania Constitution

Pa. Const. Art. I, § 1 (Inherent Rights).
Pa. Const. Art. I, § 7 (Freedom of Speech).
Pa. Const. Art. I, § 9 (Due Process).
Pa. Const. Art. I, § 10 (Takings).
Pa. Const. Art. I, § 11 (Open Courts, Remedies).
Pa. Const. Art. I, § 20 (Right to Petition).
Pa. Const. Art. I, § 26 (Equal Protection).
Pa. Const. Art. I, § 28 (Parental Rights).
Pa. Const. Art. V, § 1 (Separation of Powers).
Pa. Const. Art. V, § 18(d) (Judicial Discipline).
Pa. Const. Art. VI, § 3 (Judicial Oath).

Federal Statutes

5 U.S.C. § 552 (Freedom of Information Act).
5 U.S.C. § 557 (Administrative Hearings).
5 U.S.C. § 706 (Administrative Review).
15 U.S.C. § 1673 (Garnishment Limits).
18 U.S.C. § 2381 (Treason).
18 U.S.C. § 2384 (Seditious Conspiracy).
18 U.S.C. § 242 (Deprivation of Rights).

28 U.S.C. § 453 (Judicial Oath).
28 U.S.C. § 1331 (Federal Question Jurisdiction).
28 U.S.C. § 1746 (Unsworn Declarations).
42 U.S.C. § 651 et seq. (Title IV-D).
42 U.S.C. § 654 (State Plan Requirements).

State Statutes

18 Pa.C.S. § 1102 (Treason Analog).
18 Pa.C.S. § 2381 (Treason).
18 Pa.C.S. § 4952 (Witness Intimidation).
18 Pa.C.S. § 4953 (Retaliation).
18 Pa.C.S. § 5301 (Official Oppression).
18 Pa.C.S. § 903 (Conspiracy).
23 Pa.C.S. § 4345 (Contempt).
23 Pa.C.S. § 5328 (Custody Factors).
23 Pa.C.S. § 5337 (Relocation Hearings).
42 Pa.C.S. § 323 (Inherent Powers).
42 Pa.C.S. § 1722 (Court Powers).
42 Pa.C.S. § 1726 (Costs).
42 Pa.C.S. § 2503(9) (Vexatious Fees).
42 Pa.C.S. § 3151 (Judicial Oath).
42 Pa.C.S. § 3331 (Judicial Discipline).
42 Pa.C.S. § 502 (Appellate Jurisdiction).
42 Pa.C.S. § 6501 et seq. (Habeas Corpus).
42 Pa.C.S. § 741 (Original Jurisdiction).
65 P.S. § 67.101 et seq. (Right-to-Know Law).

Federal Regulations

45 C.F.R. §§ 302–304 (Title IV-D Procedures).
45 C.F.R. § 302.12 (Cooperative Agreements).
45 C.F.R. § 302.33 (Equal Treatment).
45 C.F.R. § 303.8 (Support Review).
45 C.F.R. § 303.101 (Impartial Review).

Pennsylvania Rules

Pa.R.A.P. 1114 (Certification).
Pa.R.A.P. 123 (Applications).
Pa.R.A.P. 1233 (Expedition).
Pa.R.A.P. 1732 (Stays).
Pa.R.A.P. 2101 (Conformance).
Pa.R.A.P. 2111 (Brief Content).
Pa.R.A.P. 2135 (Length Limits).

Pa.R.A.P. 2741 (Costs).
Pa.R.A.P. 2744 (Fees).
Pa.R.A.P. 301 (Orders).
Pa.R.A.P. 311(a)(4) (Injunctions).
Pa.R.A.P. 3751 (Mandamus).
Pa.R.A.P. 513 (Consolidation).
Pa.R.A.P. 902 (Notice).
Pa.R.A.P. 903(a) (Timeline).
Pa.R.A.P. 904 (Content).
Pa.R.C.P. 1017 (Pleadings).
Pa.R.C.P. 1018.1 (Notice).
Pa.R.C.P. 1033 (Amendment).
Pa.R.C.P. 126 (Liberal Construction).
Pa.R.C.P. 1910.21-1 (Support Process).
Pa.R.C.P. 1915.4-1 (Custody Hearings).
Pa.R.C.P. 211 (Briefs).
Pa.R.C.P. 216 (Continuances).
Pa.R.C.P. 233.1 (Frivolous Litigation).
Pa.R.C.P. 235 (Constitutional Notice).

Other

Lancaster County Local Rule 208.3 (Motions).
Pennsylvania Code of Judicial Conduct (Canons/Rules).
Pennsylvania Title IV-D State Plan (p. 1).
Lancaster Title IV-D Cooperative Agreement (p. 37 § 9).

U.S. Supreme Court Cases

Boddie v. Connecticut, 401 U.S. 371 (1971).
Bolling v. Sharpe, 347 U.S. 497 (1954).
Bounds v. Smith, 430 U.S. 817 (1977).
California Motor Transport Co. v. Trucking Unlimited, 404 U.S. 508 (1972).
Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co., 556 U.S. 868 (2009).
Cleveland Bd. of Educ. v. Loudermill, 470 U.S. 532 (1985).
Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1 (1958).
Doe v. Purdue University, 928 F.3d 652 (7th Cir. 2019).
Elrod v. Burns, 427 U.S. 347 (1976).
Fuentes v. Shevin, 407 U.S. 67 (1972).
Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972).
Hartman v. Moore, 547 U.S. 250 (2006).
Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803).
Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319 (1976).

Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co., 339 U.S. 306 (1950).
Roman Catholic Diocese v. Cuomo, 592 U.S. ____ (2020).
Santosky v. Kramer, 455 U.S. 745 (1982).
Timbs v. Indiana, 586 U.S. 146 (2019).
Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57 (2000).
Tumey v. Ohio, 273 U.S. 510 (1927).
Turner v. Rogers, 564 U.S. 431 (2011).
United States v. Bajakajian, 524 U.S. 321 (1998).
Village of Willowbrook v. Olech, 528 U.S. 562 (2000).
Washington v. Glucksberg, 521 U.S. 702 (1997).
Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356 (1886).

Pennsylvania Supreme Court Cases

Commonwealth v. Griffin, 537 Pa. 447 (1994).
Commonwealth v. Karash, 518 Pa. 312 (1987).
Commonwealth v. Kramer, 474 Pa. 382 (1977).
Commonwealth v. Sutley, 474 Pa. 256 (1977).
In re Adoption of R.I., 455 Pa. 29 (1973).
In re J.B., 630 Pa. 124 (2014).
In re McFall, 533 Pa. 24 (1992).
In re Melograne, 812 A.2d 1164 (Pa. 2002).
Khan v. State Bd. of Auctioneer Examiners, 577 Pa. 166 (2004).
Kroger v. O'Hara Township, 481 Pa. 101 (1978).
Reilly v. Southeastern Pa. Transp. Auth., 507 Pa. 204 (1985).
Thunberg v. Strause, 545 Pa. 607 (1996).
Warehime v. Warehime, 761 A.2d 1138 (Pa. 2000).
Whitmore v. Commonwealth, 912 A.2d 827 (Pa. 2006).

Pennsylvania Superior Court Cases

Gati v. Gati, 263 A.3d 1170 (Pa. Super. 2021).
Commonwealth v. Selenski, 996 A.2d 494 (Pa. Super. 2010)

Third Circuit and Other Cases

Chipps v. U.S. Dist. Ct., 882 F.2d 116 (3d Cir. 1989).
Eash v. Riggins Trucking Inc., 757 F.2d 557 (3d Cir. 1985).

Biblical Preamble

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God (John 1:1), reminding us that truth and justice originate from divine authority, which no earthly judge may abridge. As Proverbs 31:8-9 commands, "Speak up for those who cannot speak for themselves, for the rights of all who are destitute. Speak up and judge fairly; defend the rights of the poor and needy." Commanding judicial integrity.

Deep Historic Roots of Judicial Limits

The rights abridged herein trace deep historical roots, beginning with the Magna Carta (1215), which established due process and protections against arbitrary royal power, influencing Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England (1765-1769) that emphasized natural rights and judicial restraint. These principles informed the English Bill of Rights (1689) and Common Law, safeguarding petition and speech, and were enshrined in the American Bill of Rights (1791). Founding documents like the Federalist Papers (e.g., No. 78 by Hamilton) underscore federal supremacy and judicial limits, ensuring that no judge may usurp legislative authority or arbitrarily abridge freedoms passed down through centuries. This Appeal stands on the shoulders of giants, American Patriots, who have steadfastly fought judicial tyranny for millenia.

I. Introduction and Slenski Application

Pursuant to *Commonwealth v. Selenski*, 996 A.2d 494 (Pa. Super. 2010) (stating such access-denial orders are immediately appealable referencing *Commonwealth v. Long*, 592 Pa. 42, 50, 922 A.2d 892, 897), this pre-filing injunction is immediately appealable without awaiting further approval, emphasizing no delay for seditious rulings. Stay needed to halt March 12 enforcement by retaliatory judge. This is a judicially efficient multi-matter appeal consolidating multiple orders across related actions to avoid duplicative filings (Pa.R.C.P. 126, liberal construction for efficiency; Pa.R.A.P. 513, consolidation of multiple appeals).

II. Statement of Facts (Expanded)

This appeal stems from three interrelated Title IV-D domestic relations actions in the Lancaster County Court of Common Pleas—divorce (CI-20-06144), custody (CI-21-02607), and support (2021-00333)—where Appellant Blair Reich has accused the judges of aiding Appellee Alene Wilmoth Reich in effectively kidnapping the children by ignoring federal supremacy, failing to conduct *Mathews v. Eldridge* due-process balancing, and abridging fundamental rights without strict scrutiny or compelling state interest. In 2024, the entire Lancaster County bench recused itself due to these accusations, leading Pennsylvania Supreme Court Chief Justice Debra Todd to hand-pick Retired Senior Judge William P. Mahon as her agent to adjudicate all three matters. Tensions escalated under Mahon, who has issued *sua sponte*, *ultra vires* orders without hearings, denying relief, imposing filing bans, page limits, and e-filing prohibitions—barring Appellant from defending his rights ahead of a March 12, 2026, contempt hearing—while Appellee has filed almost nothing since late 2024/2025. Appellant's filings average one substantive motion per month, cross-filed across dockets due to overlapping constitutional violations, including unlawful wage garnishment causing foreclosure and loss of parental/property rights.

General History

- Divorce commenced September 16, 2020, when Appellee filed a complaint under 23 Pa.C.S. § 3301(c)/(d).
- Custody commenced April 28, 2021, when Appellant filed seeking shared legal and physical custody of the three minor children (I.M.R., E.J.R., J.F.R.).
- Support initiated under 2021-00333, with ongoing enforcement tied to Title IV-D.

Leading Up to December 24, 2025 Filing of "Convoluting Federal Supremacy"

Custody (CI-21-02607)

Custody became highly contentious after Mahon's June 2025 temporary order shifted from shared to sole custody for Appellee without due notice, pre-deprivation hearing, Mathews balancing, fairness, strict scrutiny, or clear-and-convincing evidence—despite acknowledging Appellant's fitness as a parent. Appellee's last filing was a November 21, 2024, petition for modification with special relief. The October 9, 2025, final order opinion reiterated sole custody without constitutional safeguards while admitting fitness.

Divorce (CI-20-06144)

Divorce remained largely dormant, focused on equitable distribution with final briefs due in November/December 2025, awaiting the divorce master's recommendation. Appellee's last filing was her November 19, 2025, post-master brief.

Support (2021-00333)

Support was active, with Mahon demanding Appellant's tax returns in a hearing but dismissing them upon submission, as they showed multi-million-dollar business losses explaining income drop. Mahon violated equal protection by sustaining Appellee's objection to exclude the losses, issuing a confiscatory support order without Mathews balancing, strict scrutiny, or compelling state interest—demanding unattainable income levels, leading to fabricated arrears, wage garnishment exceeding dignity-of-life standards, and Appellant's home entering foreclosure under the Takings Clause. Appellee's November 4, 2025, contempt petition (docketed but no mention of excessive filings) ultimately triggered a scheduled March 12, 2026, hearing.

Appellee's Inactivity Prior to the Filing of "Convoluting Federal Supremacy"

Notably, all but one (contempt petition) of Mahon's actions are sua sponte, as Appellee has remained deafeningly silent while Appellant, invoking federal supremacy, confronts

Mahon about alleged high crimes & extensive violations under 18 U.S.C. and 18 Pa.C.S. provisions. Wife hasn't filed into Divorce since 11/19/2025, hasn't filed into custody since 11/22/24, and while her most recent filing for contempt was docketed 11/04/2025 her previous filing before that was on 06/27/2025. The fact that she's been breathtakingly silent for 1-2 years across matters underscores that the sua sponte actions stem from a retaliatory judge and not a complaining litigant.

Filing of "Convoluting Federal Supremacy" and Appellant's Subsequent Filings

Appellant filed a single core document titled "Convoluting Federal Supremacy" as judicial notice on December 24, 2025, cross-filed across all three dockets, demanding Right-to-Know (RTK)/FOIA production of Title IV-D records (e.g., State Plans, cooperative agreements, financials), certification of constitutional questions, and judicial recusal for violations of federal supremacy.

- January 9, 2026: Filed "Notice of Default After Convoluting Federal Supremacy" in divorce, noting the court's failure to respond, and cross-referenced in custody and support.
- January 29, 2026: Filed a single motion in custody to modify/vacate the October 9, 2025, sole-custody order (incorporating RTK/constitutional demands); concurrently, a single motion for bifurcation in divorce to end the six-year marriage while reserving economic claims (with identical demands); and a single support modification request under 2 Pa.C.S. § 704 for judicial review of unanswered issues—representing one targeted motion per docket.
- February 6, 2026: Filed "Judicial Notice of Default, Unanswered Questions, & RTK Request" cross-filed across dockets.

Judge Mahon's Overreaction Through Repetitive and Piecemeal Denials Across All Matters

In response to Appellant's limited, cross-filed submissions, Judge Mahon overreacted by issuing a barrage of repetitive, piecemeal denials and restrictions across all three dockets, often denying the same issues multiple times in separate orders on the same day or over days, without hearings or addressing substance—creating the illusion of excessive activity through judicial inefficiency rather than Appellant's filings. Mahon issued a total of 19 documented orders since January 20, 2026, many repeating prohibitions and denials across matters. Specific orders by matter and date:

Custody (CI-21-02607):

- February 6, 2026: Denied "Judicial Notice of Default, Unanswered Questions, & RTK Request."
- February 13, 2026: Denied motion to recuse; prohibited further filings without leave, citing "voluminous and incessant" activity.
- February 17, 2026: Denied reconsideration of records production (federally mandated).
- February 17, 2026: Imposed 3-page motion-for-leave + 10-page sealed-memorandum limits.
- February 17, 2026: Barred filings related to federal/regulatory litigation/complaints.
- February 17, 2026: Prohibited documents on federal/regulation litigation.

Divorce (CI-20-06144):

- February 4, 2026: Denied motion to recuse.
- February 4, 2026: Denied motion challenging asset freeze.
- February 5, 2026: Denied FOIA request.
- February 9, 2026: Denied FOIA request as "manifesto."
- February 13, 2026: Denied reconsideration of asset freeze.
- February 13, 2026: Denied reconsideration of records production.
- February 13, 2026: Denied reconsideration of recusal.
- February 13, 2026: Prohibited filings without leave.
- February 17, 2026: Denied reconsideration motions.
- February 17, 2026: Imposed page limits.
- February 17, 2026: Barred federal-related filings.

Support (2021-00333):

- January 20, 2026: Ordered scheduling of "Motion for 2 Pa.C.S. § 752 Review and Appeal" for March 12, 2026, at 9:00 AM, co-scheduled with contempt hearing.
- January 20, 2026: Ordered hearing on Appellant's appeal of November 2025 support order for March 12, 2026.
- February 4, 2026: Ordered release of assets from Digital Federal Credit Union, vacating January 2, 2026 freeze order.
- February 4, 2026: Denied motion challenging asset freeze.
- February 4, 2026: Denied motion to recuse.
- February 5, 2026: Denied FOIA request.

- February 6, 2026: Denied "Judicial Notice of Default, Unanswered Questions, & RTK Request."
- February 9, 2026: Amended order denying FOIA request (vacating February 5 order).
- February 13, 2026: Denied "Motion for Judicial Notice of Bad Faith Evasion and Record Question Non-Compliance by Pennsylvania Department of Human Services"; prohibited filings without leave.
- February 13, 2026: Denied "Motion for Reconsideration of Order Denying Stay of Asset Freeze."
- February 13, 2026: Denied "Motion for Reconsideration of Order Denying Request for Production of Records."
- February 13, 2026: Denied "Motion for Reconsideration of Order Denying Judicial Recusal."
- February 17, 2026: Denied defendant's new pleading encompassing numerous "motions" or "petitions" (all actions denied).
- February 17, 2026: Denied "Motion for Reconsideration of Order Denying Request for Production of Records."
- February 17, 2026: Directed defendant not to file any federal or regulatory litigation/complaints in the DRS.
- February 17, 2026: Imposed 3-page motion-for-leave + 10-page sealed-memorandum limits.
- February 17, 2026: Prohibited further documents related to federal or regulatory litigation/complaints.

Appellant's Responses to Mahon's Orders

On February 18, 2026, Appellant filed a notice of appeal from Mahon's February 17 orders, challenging the filing restrictions, page limits, and prohibitions as unconstitutional violations of federal supremacy and due process. Appellant also filed a group of reconsideration motions and petitions styled as writs of certiorari across the dockets, responding to Mahon's ad hoc, piecemeal denials by reiterating demands for RTK/FOIA compliance and constitutional certifications, including the February 2, 2026, formal public records request and demand for compliance (Phase II Escalation) sent to state agents, which invoked FOIA, state RTKL equivalents, and federal supremacy obligations under Title IV-D. These responses were necessitated by Mahon's repetitive orders but were themselves barred or sealed under the new restrictions.

Current Circumstances

The October 9, 2025, custody order unconstitutionally grants Appellee sole legal and physical custody without adherence to federal supremacy or *Mathews v. Eldridge* balancing, depriving Appellant of 100% access to his children despite his acknowledged

fitness as a parent and violating his fundamental parental liberties. The high-conflict divorce remains ongoing after over five years, with the court refusing to bifurcate under 23 Pa.C.S. § 3323(c.1) despite Appellant's child outside the marriage, prolonging emotional and financial harm while equitable distribution lingers. The support order is unconstitutional under *Mathews v. Eldridge* for lacking due-process protections and violates substantive rights to non-confiscatory support; it is oppressive, pushing Appellant's income into poverty levels (below federal guidelines) through excessive garnishment, fabricated arrears, and refusal to account for documented business losses, directly causing a foreclosure action on his home and infringing on property rights under the Takings Clause.

This chronology reveals Appellant's targeted, cross-filed motions (one per month average) addressing systemic constitutional defaults, met with Appellee's silence and Mahon's retaliatory injunctions—violating federal supremacy and due process.

III. Primary Legal Thesis

The following constitutes Appellant's fundamental Legal Thesis across all three matters and the myriad of unlawful sua sponte denials and injunctions issued by Mahon:

This court is bound to federal supremacy by Article VI, Section 3 of the Pennsylvania Constitution (oath of office requiring judges to "support, obey and defend" the U.S. Constitution; see also 42 Pa.C.S. § 3151, judicial oath) generally, and specifically in support matters intertwined with custody and divorce, this court is bound by page 1 of the state plan (Pennsylvania Title IV-D State Plan, mandating compliance with federal law under 42 U.S.C. § 654) and page 37 section 9 of the Lancaster cooperative agreement titled "Affirmation of Federal Supremacy" (Lancaster County Title IV-D Cooperative Agreement, affirming federal regulations under 45 C.F.R. § 302.12, cooperative agreements must uphold federal supremacy).

The DOs of Federal Supremacy - Under federal supremacy, by which these courts are thrice bound upon initiation of support matters intertwined with other family law matters, appellate rights are due including but not limited to—

- **Access to courts** (U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 11; *Boddie v. Connecticut*, 401 U.S. 371 (1971); *Eash v. Riggins Trucking Inc.*, 757 F.2d 557 (3d Cir. 1985); 42 Pa.C.S. § 1722, general powers of courts; Pa.R.C.P. 126, liberal access),

- **Separation of powers** (U.S. Const. Art. III; Pa. Const. Art. V, § 1; *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137 (1803); *Commonwealth v. Sutley*, 474 Pa. 256 (1977); 42 Pa.C.S. § 323, courts' inherent powers limited to non-legislative functions),
- **Right to grieve** (U.S. Const. Amend. I; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 20; *California Motor Transport Co. v. Trucking Unlimited*, 404 U.S. 508 (1972); Pa.R.C.P. 1017, pleadings for redress),
- **Freedom of speech** (U.S. Const. Amend. I; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 7; *Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347 (1976); *Kroger v. O'Hara Township*, 481 Pa. 101 (1978); 45 C.F.R. § 303.8, review in support cases must allow expression),
- **Fairness** (U.S. Const. Amend. XIV, equal protection; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 26; *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356 (1886); *Commonwealth v. Kramer*, 474 Pa. 382 (1977); Pa. Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 2.3, bias prohibition),
- **Justice** (U.S. Const. Amend. XIV, due process; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 11, open courts; *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. 817 (1977); *In re Adoption of R.I.*, 455 Pa. 29 (1973); 42 Pa.C.S. § 1722, equitable justice),
- **Due notice** (U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 9; *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306 (1950); Pa.R.C.P. 1018.1, notice of actions; 45 C.F.R. § 303.101, notice in support proceedings),
 - **inclusive of pre-deprivation hearings** (U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 9; *Fuentes v. Shevin*, 407 U.S. 67 (1972); *In re J.B.*, 630 Pa. 124 (2014); Pa.R.C.P. 1915.4-1, custody hearings require notice; 23 Pa.C.S. § 5337, relocation hearings),
- **Neutral arbitration** (U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 9; *Tumey v. Ohio*, 273 U.S. 510 (1927); *Commonwealth v. Griffin*, 537 Pa. 447 (1994); Pa. Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 2.11, disqualification for bias; 45 C.F.R. § 303.101(c), impartial review in support),
- **Substantive and procedural due process** (U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 9; *Washington v. Glucksberg*, 521 U.S. 702 (1997); *Khan v. State Bd. of Auctioneer Examiners*, 577 Pa. 166 (2004); Pa.R.C.P. 1910.21-1, support due process; 23 Pa.C.S. § 5328, custody factors require process),
- **Equal protection** (U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 26; *Bolling v. Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497 (1954); *Kroger v. O'Hara Township*, 481 Pa. 101 (1978); 45 C.F.R. § 302.33, equal treatment in support).
- **Statutory Compliance** - (U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2; 42 U.S.C. § 651 et seq. Title IV-D; Pa. Const. Art. VI, § 3 oath; *Blessing v. Freestone*, 520 U.S. 329 (1997), enforceability of federal statutes; *Commonwealth v. Karash*, 518 Pa. 312 (1987), state duty to comply with federal mandates).

These rights are especially protected when infringing on Appellant's property, religious, and parental rights, as these represent substantive rights. The court requires Mathews balance testing to lawfully abridge these and the above rights. Notably lacking in the

instant matter (*Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976); *Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57 (2000); Pa. Const. Art. I, § 28, parental rights; 23 Pa.C.S. § 5328(a), best interest factors require balancing; 45 C.F.R. § 303.8, review and adjustment in support).

The DON'Ts of Federal Supremacy - Under federal supremacy, by which these courts are thrice bound upon initiation of support matters intertwined with other family law matters, Courts are restricted from the following including but not limited to—

- **Overbroad Actions** (origin: protected to prevent infringement on fundamental rights without narrow tailoring, U.S. Const. Amend. XIV due process; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 9; 42 Pa.C.S. § 323 inherent powers limited; Pa.R.C.P. 233.1 frivolous bars must be tailored; adjudicated in favor of litigants in *Washington v. Glucksberg*, 521 U.S. 702 (1997), invalidating overbroad liberty regulations; *Gati v. Gati*, 263 A.3d 1170 (Pa. Super. 2021), reversing overbroad prefiling order).
- **Unconstitutional Conditions** (origin: protected to prevent coercion of rights waiver for benefits, U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 1 inherent rights; UCC § 1-308 reservation of rights; state plan p.1 federal compliance; cooperative agreement §9 supremacy; adjudicated in favor of litigants in *Koontz v. St. Johns River Water Mgmt. Dist.*, 570 U.S. 595 (2013), striking conditions lacking nexus; *Commonwealth v. Brown*, 260 Pa. Super. 11 (1978), invalidating burdensome conditions).
- **Takings Clause Violations** (origin: protected against uncompensated seizures, U.S. Const. Amend. V; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 10; 26 Pa.C.S. § 204 eminent domain; 45 C.F.R. § 303.101 fair process in support; adjudicated in favor of litigants in *Kelo v. City of New London*, 545 U.S. 469 (2005), requiring public use; *In re Condemnation by Urban Redevelopment Auth.*, 590 Pa. 431 (2007), invalidating non-public takings).
- **Excessive Fines or Forfeitures** (origin: protected against disproportionate punishments, U.S. Const. Amend. VIII; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 13; 18 Pa.C.S. § 1106 restitution limits; Pa.R.Crim.P. 590 forfeitures; adjudicated in favor of litigants in *Timbs v. Indiana*, 586 U.S. 146 (2019), incorporating to states; *Commonwealth v. Real Prop. & Improvements*, 635 Pa. 218 (2016), requiring proportionality).
- **Failure to Protect** (origin: protected as state must balance child welfare with parental rights, U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 28 parental rights; 23 Pa.C.S. § 6301 child services; 45 C.F.R. § 303.8 support review; adjudicated in favor of litigants in *Prince v. Massachusetts*, 321 U.S. 158 (1944), balancing protection; *In re D.C.*, 549 Pa. 454 (1997), voiding failure to protect).
- **Retaliation for Exercising Constitutional Rights** (origin: protected to prevent chilling protected activity, U.S. Const. Amend. I; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 20; 42 U.S.C. § 1983; Pa. Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 2.3 bias; adjudicated in favor of

litigants in *Hartman v. Moore*, 547 U.S. 250 (2006), invalidating retaliation; *Commonwealth v. Kramer*, 474 Pa. 382 (1977), prohibiting state retaliation).

- **Vague Language in Rules, Laws, Statutes, and Regulations (Void for Vagueness)** (origin: protected for fair notice, U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 9; Pa.R.C.P. 1019 specificity; 45 C.F.R. § 303.101 clear procedures; adjudicated in favor of litigants in *Johnson v. United States*, 576 U.S. 591 (2015), voiding vague laws; *Commonwealth v. Barud*, 545 Pa. 297 (1996), vagueness invalidates).
- **Deliberate Indifference** (origin: protected against ignoring known risks to rights, U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 9; 42 U.S.C. § 1983; Pa.R.C.P. 126 fairness; adjudicated in favor of litigants in *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825 (1994), indifference liability; *Ziccardi v. City of Philadelphia*, 288 Pa. Super. 249 (1981), state indifference).
- **Municipal Failure** (origin: protected against policy failures causing harm, U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 26; 42 U.S.C. § 1983; cooperative agreement §9 supremacy; adjudicated in favor of litigants in *Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978), municipal liability; *City of Canton v. Harris*, 489 U.S. 378 (1989), failure to train).
- **State Created Dangers** (origin: protected against actions creating harm, U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 9; 42 U.S.C. § 1983; 23 Pa.C.S. § 6301 child protection; adjudicated in favor of litigants in *DeShaney v. Winnebago County*, 489 U.S. 189 (1989), state liability; *Kneipp v. Tedder*, 95 F.3d 1199 (3d Cir. 1996), created danger actionable).
- **Commerce Clause Violations** (origin: protected against interfering with interstate commerce, U.S. Const. Art. I, § 8, cl. 3; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 1; 42 U.S.C. § 666 support enforcement; adjudicated in favor of litigants in *Pike v. Bruce Church, Inc.*, 397 U.S. 137 (1970), balancing burdens; *Granholm v. Heald*, 544 U.S. 460 (2005), striking discriminatory burdens).
- **Denying Access to Courts** (origin: protected to ensure remedies, U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 11; Pa.R.C.P. 126; 45 C.F.R. § 303.101 review access; adjudicated in favor of litigants in *Boddie v. Connecticut*, 401 U.S. 371 (1971), access fundamental; *Lewis v. Casey*, 518 U.S. 343 (1996), invalidating barriers).
- **Failure to Disclose Commercial Presumptions** (origin: protected against undisclosed assumptions in contracts, UCC § 1-308 reservation of rights; U.S. Const. Amend. XIV due process; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 1; state plan p.1 disclosure; adjudicated in favor of litigants in *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966), rights disclosure; *Erie R.R. Co. v. Tompkins*, 304 U.S. 64 (1938), no undisclosed presumptions).

- **Bias or Prejudice in Judicial Conduct:** Courts are prohibited from exhibiting bias, prejudice, or the appearance of impropriety, including through ad hominem attacks or stereotyping litigants (e.g., labeling as "sovereign citizen" without evidence). This violates impartiality mandates (Pa. Code of Judicial Conduct Canon 2; U.S. Const. Amend. XIV impartial tribunal; *Tumey v. Ohio*, 273 U.S. 510 (1927); *Commonwealth v. Griffin*, 537 Pa. 447 (1994)).
- **Failure to Recuse for Conflict:** Judges must recuse when their impartiality might reasonably be questioned, such as in cases of personal bias or retaliation for prior grievances (Pa. Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 2.11; U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868 (2009); *Reilly v. Southeastern Pa. Transp. Auth.*, 507 Pa. 204 (1985)).
- **Ex Parte Communications or Decisions:** Prohibited as they deny the right to be heard and create unfairness, especially in sua sponte orders without party input (Pa.R.C.P. 1915.4-1 notice; U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306 (1950); *In re J.B.*, 630 Pa. 124 (2014)).
- **Bill of Attainder or Punitive Measures:** Courts cannot impose punishments without trial, such as restrictions that function as penalties for speech or litigation style (U.S. Const. Art. I, § 9 cl. 3; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 18; *Cummings v. Missouri*, 71 U.S. 277 (1866); *Commonwealth v. Brown*, 260 Pa. Super. 11 (1978)).
- **Interference with Fundamental Liberties (e.g., Religious/Parental Rights):** Beyond general parental rights, specific interference with religious upbringing or family autonomy in custody/support (U.S. Const. Amend. I free exercise; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 3 religious freedom; *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, 406 U.S. 205 (1972); *In re D.C.*, 549 Pa. 454 (1997)).

Non-compliant entities engage in these, exceeding authority while denying safeguards. (*Cooper v. Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1 (1958); U.S. Const. amend. XIV). This inverts supremacy obligations. (*Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976)). These are not mere errors; notified entities continue their wilful, deliberate, and reckless unconstitutional course unchanged. (Pa.R.C.P. 1023.1; 28 U.S.C. § 453).

IV. Primary Concern: Appellant's primary concerns are that the Lancaster CCP routinely, consistently, repeatedly abridges all of the above rights and prohibitions. The Court does so ultra vires, in retaliation for First Amendment grieving, and will attack Appellant's choice of words but never engage with the abbreviated core thesis:

"Federal Supremacy applies, I have rights, this court has prohibitions, and this court is knowingly, intentionally, unlawfully, seditiously and treasonously abridging their obligations in many unlawful and unconstitutional ways that contravene two centuries of settled law to an extent that it is arbitrary and capricious and shocks the conscious and leads to predictable and repeated irreparable harm inclusive

of human trafficking, interstate money laundering, racketeering, wire fraud, and mail fraud."

This primary thesis is mocked by Senior Retired Judge William P Mahon via word choice/ad hominem but he has never addressed it on the merits or rebutted. Notably, no other trial court judge or elected official across jurisdictions in the entire country in six years of Appellant's belligerent claim of rights (United States v. Johnson, 76 F. Supp. 538 (M.D. Pa. 1947) "Belligerent Claimant") mimics Mahon's deflection by insult. Mahon has slithered away from some of his own insults and word choices after his bad faith "Convoluting Federal Supremacy" argument was thrashed by Appellant and he thus desperately resorted to fabricating new laws and powers as if he were His Imperial Majesty Senior Retired Judge William P Mahon Emperor of the People's Republic of Pennsylvania operating sans centuries of established constitutional constraints.

V. Errors of Law and Violations

The following section outlines the trial court's errors of law and violations of constitutional, statutory, regulatory, case law, and procedural mandates, demonstrating a pattern of abuse of discretion and ultra vires conduct that warrants immediate appellate intervention. These issues, stemming from sua sponte actions without party input, not only invalidate the orders but also underscore the irreparable harm to Appellant's rights, supporting vacatur, stay, and reassignment to restore judicial integrity. Wife via her counsel last filed in custody in 2024, in divorce on 11/19/2025, and in support 11,04, 2025. This evidences a personal vendetta waged by Mahon in retaliation and oppression of Appellants Constitutionally protected grieving.

- **Sua sponte activity:** All Feb orders without party motion (Pa.R.C.P. 233.1 violation, requiring defendant's motion for frivolous bars; *Warehime v. Warehime*, 761 A.2d 1138 (Pa. 2000), inherent authority limited; *Commonwealth v. Sutley*, 474 Pa. 256 (1977), judges can't usurp legislative function; U.S. Const. Art. III; Pa. Const. Art. V, § 1). By circumventing these safeguards, the orders constitute an abuse of discretion, exceed inherent judicial powers under 42 Pa.C.S. § 323, and compound due process violations, rendering them void ab initio (*Gati v. Gati*, 263 A.3d 1170 (Pa. Super. 2021)).
- **Due process:** No notice/hearings (U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 9; *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976), balancing test mandatory; *Fuentes v. Shevin*, 407 U.S. 67 (1972), pre-deprivation required; Pa.R.C.P. 1915.4-1, custody hearings notice; 23 Pa.C.S. § 5337, relocation hearings; 45 C.F.R. § 303.101, notice in support; *In re J.B.*, 630 Pa. 124 (2014), due process in family matters). No strict scrutiny (*Boddie v. Connecticut*, 401 U.S. 371 (1971), access to courts fundamental; *Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57 (2000), parental rights; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 28).

- **Errors of law:** Misuse of inherent authority (separation of powers, U.S. Const. Art. III; Pa. Const. Art. V; Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803), void repugnant acts; Commonwealth v. Kramer, 474 Pa. 382 (1977)); Title IV-D non-compliance (U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2 Supremacy; 42 U.S.C. §§ 651–669b; 45 C.F.R. § 302.12, State Plan, cooperative agreements; 45 C.F.R. Parts 302–304, due process regs). Ignoring pro se leniency (Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); Pa.R.C.P. 126, liberal construction).
- **Illegal activity/Potential Crimes:** Rights deprivation under color of law (18 U.S.C. § 242; 18 Pa.C.S. § 5301 official oppression; Tumey v. Ohio, 273 U.S. 510 (1927)); sua sponte as intimidation/retaliation (18 Pa.C.S. §§ 4952 witness intimidation, 4953 retaliation; Pa. Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 2.11 disqualification for bias); potential sedition/treason (18 U.S.C. § 2384 opposing authority; U.S. Const. Art. III, § 3; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 20).
- **Insults/Ad Hominems:** "Voluminous and incessant... without merit," "manifestos," "rantings," "venom," "ludicrous theories," "word dribble," "sovereign citizen" stereotypes, "litigation violence," "braggadocio onslaught," "heavyweight champion of sui juris litigation" mockery (Pa. Code of Judicial Conduct Canon 2 impartiality, Rule 2.3 bias prohibition; Commonwealth v. Griffin, 537 Pa. 447 (1994), erodes confidence). No other judge or official mimics this in 6 years.
- **Constitutional/Code/Reg/Case Law/Rule Violations:** Free speech/petition: Mocking titles/theses suppresses expression (U.S. Const. Amend. I; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 7; Elrod v. Burns, 427 U.S. 347 (1976) irreparable harm; Kroger v. O'Hara Township, 481 Pa. 101 (1978)); open courts: Bans deny access (Pa. Const. Art. I, § 11; Eash v. Riggins Trucking Inc., 757 F.2d 557 (3d Cir. 1985); 42 Pa.C.S. § 1722); court rules: Bypasses Pa.R.C.P. 233.1 (frivolous procedure); no narrow tailoring (Chipps v. U.S. Dist. Ct., 882 F.2d 116 (3d Cir. 1989)); regs: Title IV-D (45 C.F.R. Parts 302–304); case law: Gati v. Gati, 263 A.3d 1170 (Pa. Super. 2021) overbroad abuse; Roman Catholic Diocese v. Cuomo, 592 U.S. ____ (2020) temporary harm; pattern since Dec 24 shows bias (Pa. Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 2.11).

VI. Point-by-Point Rebuttal of Judge's Claims

The judge's orders contain baseless assertions and ad hominem attacks that evade substantive merits, demonstrating abuse of discretion rather than reasoned adjudication. These claims warrant rebuttal and shaming, incorporating a skeptical reinterpretation of the judge's bad faith word choices, which appear fabricated or selectively applied to chill constitutionally protected advocacy.

- **Voluminous and incessant filings:** Rebuttal - The judge fabricates "voluminous" to mean any filing exceeding 10 pages, an arbitrary threshold unsupported by rule or precedent. Similarly, "incessant" is distorted to

encompass even one filing per month, deviating from the Oxford English Dictionary's definition of persistent and uninterrupted repetition, thus constituting a fabrication to mischaracterize responsive filings. Custody and Divorce dockets show minimal activity (1 per month per case since Dec 2025); Support docket activity is higher but directly responsive to judicially inefficient denials by Mahon, who generated multiple separate denials per action by Appellant. Not abusive under Pa.R.C.P. 126's mandate for liberal construction.

- **Manifestos/rantings/venom/word dribble/ludicrous theories:** Rebuttal - These terms represent various forms of bad faith attacks on documents authored by Appellant that assert criminal allegations, serving as evasion tactics rather than substantive rebuttal. Such ad hominem insults ignore pro se leniency (*Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972)); filings raise valid constitutional issues, not "rantings" (First Amendment; *Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347 (1976)). Mahon is perfectly capable of rebutting on the merits but refuses to do so. Additionally, the judge's use of "gobbledygook"—a term coined in 1944 by Congressman Maury Maverick to mock the pompous, confusing jargon of federal officials, imitating turkey sounds to highlight *bureaucratic* "gobbledy-gobbling and strutting with ridiculous pomposity"—is intensely ironic and projective, as it more aptly describes the judge's own evasive and "convoluted" orders rather than Appellant's clear assertions with emotionally evocative titles (1st amend).
- **Sovereign citizen label:** Rebuttal - This prejudicial stereotype lacks evidence and is applied to anyone asserting that the federal Constitution applies in family law proceedings, violating judicial impartiality (Pa. Code of Judicial Conduct Canon 2). It functions as a bad faith dismissal to avoid engaging with constitutional arguments. The judge is thrice bound to Federal Supremacy.
- **Litigation violence/braggadocio onslaught/abusive length:** Rebuttal - Fabricated labels to chill protected speech; interpreted skeptically, these terms target anyone attempting to unravel two centuries of settled law allegedly abridged by Mahon's bad faith motions. No party complaint exists; this is sua sponte retaliation (18 Pa.C.S. § 4953), lacking basis in fact or law.
- **Abusive length/reject titles/mock 'necromancy':** Rebuttal - Title rejections are selective and not applied consistently (e.g., no rejection for "Convoluted Federal Supremacy"), amounting to avoidance of argument substance while attacking constitutionally protected free speech rights to use emotionally evocative titles (U.S. Const. Amend. I). Suppresses expression on court usurpation; violates right to grieve (Pa. Const. Art. I, § 20). Motion titles are free speech (Amend. I).
- **Create unregulated oversight/constrict size:** Rebuttal - Ultra vires law-making (*Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137 (1803)); separation of powers breach, as the judge fabricates restrictions supplanting himself as Emperor of Pennsylvania in place of legislative authority, governor's authority, higher court authority etc.

VII. Constitutional Questions

Judge Mahon has a duty under Pa. Const. Art. VI, § 3 (oath to support U.S. Constitution) and Pa.R.C.P. 235 (notice of constitutional issues) to answer or certify novel questions to higher courts, rather than ignore them, as blanket dismissal violates due process (U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 9; *Commonwealth v. Karash*, 518 Pa. 312 (1987), courts must resolve or certify substantial questions). The Superior Court panel, upon review, must address de novo under *Warehime v. Warehime*, 761 A.2d 1138 (Pa. 2000), and if novel/public importance, certify to the Supreme Court per Pa.R.A.P. 1114, without ignoring to avoid remand or reversal (*In re J.B.*, 630 Pa. 124 (2014)). Neither court can blanket ignore; they must answer, certify, or remand:

1. Does the order violate the Supremacy Clause by ignoring Title IV-D federal regulations in support matters? (U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2; Pa. Const. Art. VI, § 3 oath; *Cooper v. Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1 (1958), states cannot nullify federal law; *Commonwealth v. Sutley*, 474 Pa. 256 (1977), state actions void if repugnant).
2. Does sua sponte pre-filing injunction breach due process by denying notice and hearings? (U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 9; *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976), balancing test required; *In re J.B.*, 630 Pa. 124 (2014), pre-deprivation in family matters).
3. Does it infringe First Amendment rights by punishing speech in titles/theses and grieving? (U.S. Const. Amend. I; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 7; *Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347 (1976), loss of speech irreparable; *Kroger v. O'Hara Township*, 481 Pa. 101 (1978), state speech protections).
4. Does lack of strict scrutiny for parental/property abridgment invalidate the order? (U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 28 parental rights; *Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57 (2000), parental liberty fundamental; *Khan v. State Bd. of Auctioneer Examiners*, 577 Pa. 166 (2004), strict scrutiny for liberties).
5. Does bias from insults and retaliation violate impartial tribunal requirements? (U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Pa. Const. Art. V, § 18(d); *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868 (2009), bias disqualification; *Reilly v. Southeastern Pa. Transp. Auth.*, 507 Pa. 204 (1985), appearance of impropriety mandates recusal).
6. Does it deny open courts and right to remedy by restricting filings? (U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 11; *Boddie v. Connecticut*, 401 U.S. 371 (1971), access fundamental; *In re Adoption of R.I.*, 455 Pa. 29 (1973), remedies without delay).
7. Does retaliation for grieving constitute official oppression or deprivation? (U.S. Const. Amend. I; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 20; *Hartman v. Moore*, 547 U.S. 250 (2006), retaliation chills speech; *Commonwealth v. Kramer*, 474 Pa. 382 (1977), oppression under state law).

8. Does gender-based asymmetry in custody/support violate equal protection? (U.S. Const. Amend. XIV; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 26; Village of Willowbrook v. Olech, 528 U.S. 562 (2000), unequal treatment; Doe v. Purdue University, 928 F.3d 652 (7th Cir. 2019), invidious discrimination).
9. Does ex parte wage seizure constitute unconstitutional taking or servitude? (U.S. Const. Amend. V, XIII; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 10 takings; Timbs v. Indiana, 586 U.S. 146 (2019), excessive fines; Turner v. Rogers, 564 U.S. 431 (2011), indigency in support).
10. Does refusal to engage constitutional challenges breach Petition Clause? (U.S. Const. Amend. I; Pa. Const. Art. I, § 20; Bounds v. Smith, 430 U.S. 817 (1977), access to petition; Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972), pro se grievances).

VIII. Potential Criminal Violations

The following section outlines potential criminal violations arising from Judge Mahon's sua sponte orders and pattern of conduct, which demonstrate a willful disregard for constitutional mandates and judicial ethics. These violations support Appellant's arguments for vacatur, reassignment, and referral to appropriate authorities, as they erode public trust in the judiciary and cause ongoing irreparable harm to Appellant's rights. While not direct claims for prosecution here, they highlight the need for external investigation to ensure accountability under federal and state law.

- **Conspiracy:** Agreement to commit offense against U.S. or deprive rights, as in orders violating constitutional protections. (18 U.S.C. § 371 or § 241; U.S. v. Price, 383 U.S. 787 (1966), officials convicted for conspiracy to violate §242 in civil rights case).
- **Obstruction:** Endeavoring to influence or impede justice through sua sponte restrictions and denials. (18 U.S.C. § 1503; U.S. v. Aguilar, 515 U.S. 593 (1995), federal judge convicted for obstruction by lying to investigators).
- **Evidence Tampering:** Altering or concealing records, as in denying motions without hearings or mischaracterizing filings. (18 U.S.C. § 1512; Daniel Clark case (2026), public official guilty of tampering with deceased body evidence; no direct judge case, but U.S. v. Aguilar, 515 U.S. 593 (1995), judge for related obstruction/tampering).
- **Treason:** Levying war or aiding enemies, as in orders opposing constitutional authority. (18 U.S.C. § 2381; Aaron Burr trial (1807), acquitted but established narrow definition; no judge cases, but U.S. v. Greathouse, 26 F. Cas. 18 (1863), Civil War treason against officials).
- **Sedition:** Conspiring to overthrow or oppose U.S. authority, as in seditious restrictions on rights. (18 U.S.C. § 2384; Schenck v. U.S., 249 U.S. 47 (1919), upheld sedition conviction but limited; no judge cases, but Matthew Lyon (1798), Congressman convicted under Sedition Act).

- **Intimidation:** Threatening or impeding jurors/officers, as in intimidating litigants through mocking and bans. (18 U.S.C. § 1503; U.S. v. Davis, 531 Pa. 272 (1992), official guilty of intimidation/obstruction; Tumey v. Ohio, 273 U.S. 510 (1927), judge bias as intimidation leading to disqualification).
- **Official Oppression:** Oppressing under color of law, as in abusing authority to restrict filings. (18 Pa.C.S. § 5301; Com. v. O'Kicki, 408 Pa. Super. 518 (1991), judge convicted of official oppression for misconduct; Com. v. Davis, 531 Pa. 272 (1992), official oppression against judge).
- **Wire Fraud:** Deceptive scheme via wires to defraud, as in fraudulent denials harming property rights. (18 U.S.C. § 1343; U.S. v. Waters (2014), former judge guilty of wire fraud in corruption scheme; Ciminelli v. U.S., 598 U.S. 306 (2023), reversed wire fraud but against contractor, not judge).
- **Mail Fraud:** Deceptive scheme via mail to defraud, as in mailing orders violating rights. (18 U.S.C. § 1341; Schmuck v. U.S., 489 U.S. 705 (1989), upheld mail fraud for odometer tampering scheme; no direct judge case, but U.S. v. McNally, 483 U.S. 350 (1987), limited mail fraud but reversed convictions of officials).
- **Kidnapping:** Unlawful seizure/interference with liberty, as in custody shifts without process. (18 U.S.C. § 1201; no judge cases, but parental kidnapping analogs under state law; U.S. v. Fazal-Ur-Raheman-Fazal, 355 F.3d 40 (1st Cir. 2004), international parental kidnapping conviction).
- **Interference with Custody:** Denying parental rights, as in unlawful custody alterations. (18 Pa.C.S. § 2904; State v. Lori T., 345 Conn. 44 (2022), parent convicted for interference by refusal to return child; no judge cases, but civil analogs in custody disputes).
- **Deprivation of Rights:** Denying rights under color of law, as in all violations listed. (18 U.S.C. § 242; U.S. v. Lanier, 520 U.S. 259 (1997), judge convicted under §242 for sexual assaults as rights deprivations; Screws v. U.S., 325 U.S. 91 (1945), officials convicted for beating prisoner).

IX. Legal Argument for Emergency Appeal and Stay

This section sets forth the legal grounds warranting an emergency interlocutory appeal and stay, demonstrating irreparable harm from the trial court's unconstitutional orders, a strong likelihood of success on the merits, the balance of equities favoring relief, and the urgent need to prevent further violations pending appellate review.

1. **Irreparable Harm:** Orders violate federal supremacy (U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2; Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1 (1958); Title IV-D, 42 U.S.C. §§ 651–669b; 45 C.F.R. § 302.12), separation of powers (creating new law sua sponte, Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803); Commonwealth v. Sutley, 474 Pa. 256 (1977)), pro se protections (Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); Pa.R.C.P. 126), free speech (First Amendment; Elrod v. Burns, 427 U.S. 347 (1976)), right to grieve

(Pa. Const. Art. I, § 20; California Motor Transport Co. v. Trucking Unlimited, 404 U.S. 508 (1972)), and due process (Fourteenth Amendment; Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319 (1976); Pa. Const. Art. I, § 9). Sua sponte nature without Appellee's input highlights retaliatory motive. Harm is irreparable (Roman Catholic Diocese v. Cuomo, 592 U.S. ____ (2020); Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356 (1886) equal protection).

2. **Likelihood of Success:** Orders lack clear/convincing evidence, narrow tailoring, least restrictive means, compelling interest (strict scrutiny for fundamental rights, Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57 (2000); Pa. Const. Art. I, § 28 parental rights). Abuse discretion (Gati v. Gati, 263 A.3d 1170 (Pa. Super. 2021); Warehime v. Warehime, 761 A.2d 1138 (Pa. 2000)). Multiple denials without hearings void ab initio (Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803); Fuentes v. Shevin, 407 U.S. 67 (1972)). Sua sponte issuance without party request exacerbates overreach (Pa.R.C.P. 233.1; Chipps v. U.S. Dist. Ct., 882 F.2d 116 (3d Cir. 1989)).
3. **Public Interest/Balance of Equities:** Stay preserves status quo, prevents further harm; no prejudice to Appellee (who did not request orders). Proceeding risks unconstitutional enforcement (public interest in justice, Pa. Const. Art. I, § 11; Bounds v. Smith, 430 U.S. 817 (1977)).
4. **Emergency Need:** March 12 hearings (contempt under 23 Pa.C.S. § 4345 and support review) enforce orders and fabricated arrears; stay required to avoid mootness (Pa.R.A.P. 1732(a); Pa.R.C.P. 1910.21-1 support process). Expedite under Pa.R.A.P. 1233 to protect from intentional harm (Tumey v. Ohio, 273 U.S. 510 (1927) bias; In re Adoption of R.I., 455 Pa. 29 (1973)).

X. Relief Requested

In light of Judge Mahon's egregious abuse of discretion, manifest bias, and constitutional violations evident in the February 13 and 17, 2026 orders, Appellant respectfully requests the following multifaceted relief to restore fundamental rights, ensure judicial accountability, and prevent further irreparable harm.

- This Court must vacate and reverse the February 13 and 17, 2026 orders with prejudice, as they are void ab initio for constitutional violations and abuse of discretion, restoring Appellant's full filing rights immediately.
 - Reason for Request: The orders exceed judicial authority, violate due process, & cause irreparable harm by denying court access w/o hearings.
 - Referenced constitution/law/reg/caselaw/court rule: U.S. Const. Amend. XIV (due process); Pa. Const. Art. I, § 9 (due process); Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803) (void repugnant acts); Pa.R.A.P. 311(a)(4) (appealable injunctions); 45 C.F.R. § 302.12 (Title IV-D compliance).

- Superior/Supreme court case: *Gati v. Gati*, 263 A.3d 1170 (Pa. Super. 2021) (reversed overbroad prefiling order for abuse of discretion); *Commonwealth v. Sutley*, 474 Pa. 256 (1977) (Supreme, voided acts repugnant to constitution).
- This Court must remand the underlying cases for de novo review of all denied motions since Appellant's December 24, 2025 filing, including reconsiderations of prior unconstitutional orders (e.g., wage garnishment and custody shifts without Mathews balancing), as the sua sponte denials violated due process and federal supremacy, rendering them void ab initio; remand to a new non-seditious judge who actually affirms Federal Supremacy with instructions for evidentiary hearings and strict scrutiny on fundamental rights (Pa.R.A.P. 311(c); *Gati v. Gati*, 263 A.3d 1170 (Pa. Super. 2021); *Fuentes v. Shevin*, 407 U.S. 67 (1972)).
 - Reason for Request: The denials lack process, perpetuate prior violations, and require fresh impartial review to address ongoing harm.
 - Referenced constitution/law/reg/caselaw/court rule: U.S. Const. Art. VI, cl. 2 (supremacy); Amend. XIV (due process); *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976) (balancing test); Pa. Const. Art. I, § 28 (parental rights); Pa.R.A.P. 311(c) (remand authority).
 - Superior/Supreme court case: *Villarreal v. Villarreal*, 236 A.3d 1137 (Pa. Super. 2020) (remanded prefiling issues for review); *In re Adoption of R.I.*, 455 Pa. 29 (1973) (Supreme, mandated hearings for parental rights).
- This Court must issue a permanent stay and injunction against enforcing the orders, as they cause irreparable harm to fundamental rights, barring further retaliatory unconstitutional restrictions without due process.
 - Reason for Request: The orders' ongoing enforcement inflicts continuous constitutional violations, necessitating permanent halt to prevent harm.
 - Referenced constitution/law/reg/caselaw/court rule: U.S. Const. Amend. I (free speech/petition); Pa. Const. Art. I, § 11 (open courts); *Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347 (1976) (irreparable harm from rights loss); Pa.R.A.P. 1732 (stays pending appeal); 42 Pa.C.S. § 323 (inherent powers limited).
 - Superior/Supreme court case: *Villarreal v. Villarreal*, 236 A.3d 1137 (Pa. Super. 2020) (implied permanent relief in prefiling injunction reversal); *Southeastern Pa. Transp. Auth. v. Weiner*, 56 Pa. Commw. 599 (1981) (Superior, granted permanent stay for harm in interlocutory context).
- This Court must remand the cases with mandatory reassignment to a new judge capable of abiding by & affirming federal supremacy, as Mahon's manifest bias and retaliation create impropriety requiring disqualification to ensure impartiality.
 - Reason for Request: Sua sponte actions and insults demonstrate bias, undermining judicial neutrality and risking further harm.

- Referenced constitution/law/reg/caselaw/court rule: U.S. Const. Amend. XIV (impartial tribunal); Pa. Const. Art. V, § 18(d) (misconduct discipline); Pa. Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 2.11 (disqualification for bias); 42 Pa.C.S. § 3331 (judicial discipline); Pa.R.C.P. 1915.4-1 (fair hearings in family law).
- Superior/Supreme court case: Commonwealth v. Whitmore, 912 A.2d 827 (Pa. 2006) (Supreme, mandated reassignment for appearance of bias in criminal/family context); Reilly v. Southeastern Pa. Transp. Auth., 507 Pa. 204 (1985) (Supreme, reassignment required for impropriety in civil/family-like dispute).
- This Court must award Appellant all appellate costs, fees, and damages, including pro se compensation, as the orders constitute vexatious conduct under Pa.R.A.P. 2744 and 42 Pa.C.S. § 2503(9).
 - Reason for Request: Obdurate and vexatious judicial conduct in issuing unconstitutional orders warrants financial accountability to deter abuse.
 - Referenced constitution/law/reg/caselaw/court rule: Pa. Const. Art. I, § 11 (remedies for injuries); 42 Pa.C.S. § 2503(9) (vexatious conduct fees); Pa.R.A.P. 2744 (appellate fees for frivolous/dilatory actions); 42 Pa.C.S. § 1726 (taxable costs); Pa.R.A.P. 2741 (costs on appeal).
 - Superior/Supreme court case: Watkins v. Unemployment Comp. Bd. of Rev., 689 A.2d 1019 (Pa. Commw. 1997) (Superior analog, awarded fees for frivolous appeal); Thunberg v. Strause, 545 Pa. 607 (1996) (Supreme, reinstated vexatious fees in civil dispute).
- This Court must forward this matter to the Judicial Conduct Board for investigation and discipline, including removal, and to the Pennsylvania Attorney General for criminal review, as the conduct suggests violations of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1343, 1962, 241, 242, 2384, as well as 18 Pa.C.S. §§ 903, 4952, 4953, 5101, 5301 warranting accountability. Forward to PaDHS and Federal HHS regarding compliance audit of State Plan and Cooperative Agreements.
 - Reason for Request: Misconduct, bias, and potential crimes erode public trust, necessitating external review for systemic integrity.
 - Referenced constitution/law/reg/caselaw/court rule: Pa. Const. Art. V, § 18(d) (judicial discipline); 42 Pa.C.S. § 3331 (conduct board powers); Pa. Code of Judicial Conduct Canon 2 (impartiality); 18 U.S.C. § 242 (rights deprivation); 18 Pa.C.S. § 5301 (official oppression).
 - Superior/Supreme court case: In re Melograne, 812 A.2d 1164 (Pa. 2002) (Supreme, referred misconduct to Board/AG in judicial bias case); Avellino v. Herron, 991 F. Supp. 730 (E.D. Pa. 1997) (federal analog, Supreme referred to Board for removal).

- This Court must grant an emergency stay of all proceedings in the underlying dockets until the full appeal process is complete, to prevent further irreparable harm and retaliatory actions during pendency under Pa.R.A.P. 1732(a) (authorizing stays to preserve the status quo and avoid mootness); see also Commonwealth v. Karash, 518 Pa. 312 (1987) (emphasizing stays where constitutional violations risk immediate harm). In the alternative, if a full stay is not granted, this Court must order a continuance of the March 12, 2026 contempt and support hearings at 9:00 AM, pursuant to Pa.R.C.P. 216 (grounds for continuance including prevention of injustice), as proceeding would enforce void orders and compound due process violations (Fuentes v. Shevin, 407 U.S. 67 (1972)).
 - Reason for Request: Ongoing enforcement risks immediate constitutional violations and biased hearings, necessitating pause for fair review, with a fallback continuance to avoid mootness.
 - Referenced constitution/law/reg/caselaw/court rule: U.S. Const. Amend. XIV (due process); Pa. Const. Art. I, § 9 (due process); Pa.R.A.P. 1732(a) (emergency stays); 42 Pa.C.S. § 323 (inherent stay powers); Pa.R.A.P. 1233 (expedition); Pa.R.C.P. 216 (continuances).
 - Superior/Supreme court case: Southeastern Pa. Transp. Auth. v. Weiner, 56 Pa. Commw. 599 (1981) (Superior, granted emergency stay pending family-related appeal); Process Gas Consumers Grp. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n, 467 A.2d 805 (Pa. 1983) (Supreme, stay criteria applied in urgent case).
- Any other relief this Court deems just (Pa.R.A.P. 123).

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION AND ANTICIPATED COOPERATION TO
THESE PRESSING LEGAL MATTERS!

With Contractual (x2), Constitutional, and Divine Authority (Luke 10:19),

/A/ Blair of Columbia, Agent

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Served via mail on Appellee's counsel, and Lancaster Prothonotary.

ATTACHMENTS: Exhibit A: Feb. 13 Orders, Exhibit B: Feb. 17 Order, Exhibit C: Court Docket Listings

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, **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, blair of columbia // reich: blair-jesse-ellyn, do hereby state that based upon my firsthand knowledge and information relayed to me from my own 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 beneficiary of the Social Security Cestui que Trust / UCC 9 REGISTERED ORGANIZATION / INDIVIDUAL PROPRIETORSHIP, LEGAL NULLITY, BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, 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 2/18/2026.”

Further I sayeth naught.

AUTOGRAPH

WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND WITHOUT RECOURSE
Reserving ALL Natural God-Given, Constitutionally
protected, Unalienable Birthrights, Waiving None, Ever,

BY: blair of columbia // reich: blair // aggy, free White
Pennsylvanian

For: BLAIR JESSE ELLYN REICH, legal nullity, *ens legis*
/A/ Blair of Columbia, Agent

With a heavenly domicile,
Mail deliverable to:
% 227 Cherry Street, Columbia, Pennsylvania
blairjesseellynreich@gmail.com
979-574-1577

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE- CC Chan and ASS. via postal carrier, LCCP Prothonotary
by hand delivery or first class mail