

1 Dr. Orly Taitz ESQ.
2 29839 Santa Margarita Pkwy Suite 100
3 Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688
4 Phone (949) 683-5411 fax (949) 766-7603
5 Email: Orly.taitz@gmail.com
6 CA Bar license 223433
7 Counselor for Plaintiffs
8

9 U.S. DISTRICT COURT
10 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11 SOUTHERN DIVISION

12 Judd et al) case 12-cv-1507
13 v) Honorable Judge Carter Presiding
14 Obama et al)

15 Administrative Motion to correct record is filed in conjunction with a Motion for
16 STAY and Expedite

17 Argument

18 1. Plaintiffs by and through their attorney request to correct the record on the
19 following. The court sua sponte made an entry in the record of the case changing
20 the schedule for return of summons from 21 days to 60 days, which is the return
21 schedule for the federal employees. Plaintiffs request a correction noting that only
22 federal employees has 60 days to respond, the rest of the plaintiffs have only 21
23 days to respond. Federal employees are Donohue, Astrue, Holder, Napolitano and
24 possibly Chatfield, who is retired from the federal government, but is sued in
25 relation to his work, as an employee of the federal government. The other 24
26 named defendants have to file an answer within 21 days. This is particularly
27
28

1 important as this is an elections case, 2012 election is only one month away and
2 the time is of the essence.

3 2. Plaintiffs would like to correct mischaracterization of the case. This case is a
4 new legal challenge. Out of 30 named defendants, 27 defendants are new
5 defendants. 3 defendants: Feinstein, Emken and Obama are being currently sued in
6 the Superior court of California. Feinstein, Emken and Obama were sued in
7 elections challenge brought pursuant to California elections code 16100, 16101,
8 16420-16421 Taitz v Obama et al 30-2012 -00582135 Superior Court of CA Judge
9 Sanders. Defendants Emken, Feinstein and Obama were served on July 9, 2012.
10 The original challenge to the Ca Primary election had to be filed in the state court
11 pursuant to 16100-16-101. Defendants did not respond to service and the case
12 management conference is set for October 22 before Honorable judge Sanders.
13 Current case in the federal court is related to the ongoing elections challenge in the
14 California Superior court. Plaintiffs request to correct the docket in noting that this
15 is a new case and in relation to three of the 30 defendants it is related to a case filed
16 in CA Superior court. Plaintiffs request to treat this case as a case challenging the
17 violation of Constitutional rights of the Plaintiffs and relating to the elections
18 challenge filed in the state court. In 2010, a candidate to the U.S. Senate Joe miller
19 has filed and elections challenge and an accompanying case of civil rights
20 violations in the Federal court. In Miller v Campbell 3:10-cv-252 RRB U.S.
21 District Court Judge Ralph Beistline ruled:

22 "...Therefore, for the reasons articulated above and by
23 Defendants in their Motion to Dismiss for Lack of
24 Federal Question Jurisdiction or in the Alternative to Abstain
25 at Docket 17, which Plaintiff responded to at Docket 20, this
26 matter is hereby **STAYED** so that the parties may bring this
27 dispute before the appropriate State tribunal. The Court shall
28

1 retain jurisdiction pursuant to Pullman and will remain
2 available to review any constitutional issues that may exist
3 once the State remedies have been exhausted. In order to ensure
4 that these serious State law issues are resolved prior to
5 certification of the election, the Court hereby
6 conditionally **GRANTS** Plaintiff's motion to enjoin certification
7 of the election. If an action is filed in State Court on or
8 before **November 22, 2010**, the results of this election shall
9 not be certified until the legal issues raised therein have been
10 fully and finally resolved. **IT IS SO ORDERED.** ENTERED this 19th
11 day of November, 2010. S/RALPH R. BEISTLINE UNITED STATES
12 DISTRICT JUDGE". Plaintiffs are seeking a notation by the court
13 stating that this is related case to Taitz v Obama et al 30-
14 2012-00582135.

15
16
17 Conclusion

18 Administrative motion should be granted. Docket should be
19 corrected, reflecting that non-federal defendants have only 21
20 days to respond.

21 Correction should be made reflecting that this is a new
22 case, not a removal case, but it is correlated with the state
23 lections challenge Taitz v Obama et al 30-2012 -00582135 Superior Court
24 of CA Judge Glenda Sanders.
25

26 Respectfully submitted
27
28



/s/ Dr. Orly Taitz, ESQ

10.02.2012


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Certificate of Service

I, Lila Dubert, not a party to this case, I attest that on 10 02.2012 I served
by first class mail all the defendants with the copy of the attached pleadings.

/s/ Lila Dubert

10.02.2012

A handwritten signature in purple ink, appearing to read 'Lila Dubert', is written over the typed name and date. The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial 'L' and 'D'.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Proposed order

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

Judd et al) case 12-cv-1507
v) Honorable Judge Carter Presiding
Obama et al)

Plaintiffs' 10.02. 2012 administrative motion to correct docket is
GRANTED.

U.S. District Court Judge David O. Carter