

**RECEIVED**

DEC 11 2019

S.C. SUPREME COURT

**2019-001852**

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH  
CAROLINA  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA**

**STRITZINGER v SOUTH CAROLINA**

**SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF CERTIORARI AND REHEARING AND TRANSFER TO  
FEDERAL JURISDICTION**

**REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT**

Trial Court Cause - 2018CP4002738

John Stritzinger  
2156 Cresthill Rd  
Columbia, SC 29223  
843-352-3459  
[Jstritzinger33@gmail.com](mailto:Jstritzinger33@gmail.com)

## **STATEMENT ON ORAL ARGUMENT**

Non-Resident John S. Stritzinger requests oral argument as soon as the court can schedule a review.

### **A. PREVIOUS ISSUES UNDER REVIEW**

1. Did the Court of appeals make a Reversible Error?
2. Should this court issue an order of plain error, or do a De Novo Review
3. Powers of the Trial Court to Consolidate Cases
4. Transfer of the Case to Different Trial Jurisdiction
5. Citizenship and Powers of the Trial Court
6. Jurisdiction of Federal Employees
7. Emergency Issues with Children – Domestic Problems
8. Suspension by a Lower Court of the State's Highest Trial Court.
9. Misconduct by South Carolina Professionals
10. Does John S. Stritzinger have a contract with Bank of America?
11. Does John S. Stritzinger have a contract with Verizon?
12. Invalid Invoices by State Contracted Professionals Assessed against Credit
13. State Judges entering National Security Orders

### **B. SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS FOR THE COURT'S REVIEW**

14. Should Common Carriers & Financial Institutions Be Reimbursed for Electronic Records including Geocoding of the same?
15. Do Local Law Enforcement Officers need a Warrant to Obtain Banking, and Telecommunications Records which positively determine the parties location. (See US Supreme Court Carpenter v US - 585 US \_ (2018))

## C. PARTIES

- i) **John Stritzinger – PRO SE – Appellant – As Previously provided**
- Appellants own behalf,
  - And on Behalf of Barrack H. Obama – President of the United States
  - And as a suspended employee of Verizon under executive orders by Mr. Obama to complete work undertaken on the US Governments behalf.
  - and As an officer of Bank of America (Mortgage and Technology) but as of yet unrepresented or denied resources by Ms. Smith and Mr. Moynihan.
- ii) **South Carolina**  
Gregory Parker – Outsourced Prosecutor - Jerry Reardon Law  
Doug Farrar – Richland County  
Mr. Larry Smith – Richland County
- iii) **Palmetto Health – (Now Prisma) on Behalf of the State of South Carolina**  
Dr. Jeffrey Raynor – Director Palmetto Richland Hospital  
Mental Health Programs  
13 Medical Parkway  
Columbia, SC 29203
- iv) **Verizon Corporation**  
Joe Palmieri – Associate General Counsel – Patent Legal Programs  
One Verizon Way  
Basking Ridge NJ 07920  
**Self – Representation of the Corporation**
- v) **Verizon Federal**  
Brian Kennedy – Associate Federal Counsel – Federal Contracting Lawyer  
22001 Loudoun County Parkway  
Ashburn, VA 20147
- Represented by D. Crain, and Patrick Blake  
Wilcox and Savage
- vi) **Verizon Wireless**  
Represented by Mr. Palmieri as listed above, and Appellant in his duties as Contracting Officer to President Obama and the Department of Homeland Security.  
North Charleston, SC

**Mr. Palmieri advised Appellants Manager Mr. Asiedu, and President of Federal Business Zeleniak that he and Appellant would manage Mr. Obama's request from the NSC.**

- vii) **Bank of America Corporation**  
With Officers Smith(CAO), and Moynihan (CEO)  
100 N. Tryon Street  
Charlotte, NC 28202  
Vernon Wright, Andrea Smith & Brian T. Moynihan Personally

All represented by S. Knight, L. Slusky and Amanda Groves  
Winston and Strawn  
300 S Tryon St Suite 1600  
Charlotte, NC 28202

And Mr. Wright hired James Richardson  
221 West 6<sup>th</sup> Street – Suite 600  
Austin, Texas 78738

And Louis Freeh Jr  
Freeh Investigations  
Wilmington DE 19806

In support of his role as former officer of Bank of America Card Services, and MBNA Corporation (Global). **Mr. Wright retired with full pay and benefits but was THREE levels below appellant at the corporation.**

- viii) **Katherine Wright, Vernon Wright, James W. Stritzinger, Lucy L. Stritzinger, Hannah M. Stritzinger(Adult Children of Katherine and John)**  
**14626 Thorton Mill Drive**  
**Sparks, MD 21152**  
**All Unrepresented at this point in time.**
- ix) **James R. Stritzinger Jr – University of South Carolina**  
695 Bluff Pt & Unknown Work Address to Be Supplemented  
Columbia, SC 29203  
843-2904149
- x) **Judges Newman, Belton, and Smiley – State of South Carolina**  
South Carolina District Courthouse  
1701 Main Street  
Columbia, SC 29201

## D. TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Contents

STATEMENT ON ORAL ARGUMENT.....	2
A. PREVIOUS ISSUES UNDER REVIEW .....	2
1. Did the Court of appeals make a Reversible Error? .....	2
2. Should this court issue an order of plain error, or do a De Novo Review .....	2
3. Powers of the Trial Court to Consolidate Cases .....	2
4. Transfer of the Case to Different Trial Jurisdiction .....	2
5. Citizenship and Powers of the Trial Court .....	2
6. Jurisdiction of Federal Employees .....	2
7. Emergency Issues with Children – Domestic Problems .....	2
8. Suspension by a Lower Court of the State’s Highest Trial Court. ....	2
9. Misconduct by South Carolina Professionals .....	2
10. Does John S. Stritzinger have a contract with Bank of America? .....	2
11. Does John S. Stritzinger have a contract with Verizon? .....	2
12. Invalid Invoices by State Contracted Professionals Assessed against Credit .....	2
13. State Judges entering National Security Orders .....	2
B. SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS FOR THE COURT’S REVIEW .....	2
C. PARTIES .....	3
i) John Stritzinger – PRO SE – Appellant – As Previously provided .....	3
ii) South Carolina .....	3
iii) Palmetto Health – (Now Prisma) on Behalf of the State of South Carolina .....	3
iv) Verizon Corporation .....	3
v) Verizon Federal .....	3
vi) Verizon Wireless .....	3
vii) Bank of America Corporation .....	4
viii) Katherine Wright, Vernon Wright, James W. Stritzinger, Lucy L. Stritzinger, Hannah M. Stritzinger(Adult Children of Katherine and John) .....	4
ix) James R. Stritzinger Jr – University of South Carolina .....	4
x) Judges Newman, Belton, and Smiley – State of South Carolina .....	4
D. TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	6

E.	LOWER COURT RULINGS.....	8
F.	AN ORAL ARGUMENT IS REQUESTED BY APPELLANT IN THIS CAUSE. ....	8
G.	LEGAL STANDARDS .....	8
H.	CASE LAW.....	9
I.	SUPPLEMENTAL FACTS(CONTINUATION OF PREVIOUS BRIEF) .....	9
J.	SUPPLEMENTAL ARGUMENTS.....	12
K.	RELIEF REQUESTED.....	13
L.	PRAYER.....	13
M.	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	13

## **E. LOWER COURT RULINGS**

Appellant is the former COO of Bank of America, and Chief Architect for Verizon Federal Civil Programs in Virginia. Appellant has two corporations today where his children are the only stockholders.

Appellant was the engineer assigned by Verizon the Supreme Court of the United States, the Federal Reserve Bank, the Department of Energy, and the Department of Homeland Security. Appellant has more than 30 years of technology and Operations Experience in companies as large as 120B dollars in revenue, and designed most of the Global Networks at Bank of America built since 2000.

There have been more than 15 evidentiary rulings by the lower courts which Appellant will supplement in the near future which require significant discussion.

Effectively State Employees of Virginia, Delaware, and South Carolina have sought to suspend civil litigation while they claim mental health issues, after three US District Judges refused to issue a Summons to Verizon Federal where he worked and had significant amounts due.

The State of Virginia Magistrate told Appellant that it was a felony to owe any individual 10K in payroll, and in this case both Verizon, and Bank of America owe him in excess of 10M dollars but the State of Virginia refused to enter a criminal police report until he paid fines. The fines were not possible to be paid because of the Criminal claims which Verizon entered which took several years to try, and dismiss across five states (PA, MD, DE, SC, FL). In other words local police officers believe they can retry the same sets of facts due to the US Supreme Court ruling in *Heath v Alabama*. Appellant believes that judgement is in error due to Article IV of the US constitution. Appellant believes a state can only try facts which occurred after the last criminal circuit appearance, unless another circuit judge suspends the issue for later trial EXPLICITLY.

In this case a Maryland trial court judge very shortly after Verizon entered a claim found in his favor, but Virginia, and Florida police officers decided to try to push criminal investigations of their own because the subject matter impacted their own business (location processing for law enforcement). However the US Supreme Court has already ruled on this issue in *Carpenter v US*, requiring a warrant for location or cell phone (*Riley v California*) searches.

## **F. AN ORAL ARGUMENT IS REQUESTED BY APPELLANT IN THIS CAUSE.**

## **G. LEGAL STANDARDS**

- Code of Virginia - 40.1.29 - Wage Laws
- South Carolina - Involuntary Dismissal for Error - Rule 41
- South Carolina - Rule 260 - Dismissal and Reinstatement
- Article IV of the US Constitution
- Article I Section III of the SC Constitution - Due Process of Law
- Fifth Amendment to the US Constitution
- 28 USC 1332 - Diversity of Citizenship

- 28 USC 1441 – Transfer to Federal Jurisdiction
- 1 USC 73 Section 13 – Jurisdiction of Supreme Court Over Domestic Employees of the Whitehouse

## H. CASE LAW

### US Supreme Court Causes: TOPIC

- Marbury v Madison – Issue of Badges to NSTAC participants.
- Heath v Alabama – Sovereignty of States to Retry Criminal Issues
- Daubert v Merrell Pharmaceuticals – Requirements for Federal Expert Status
- Olmstead v United States – Equitable Relief following Criminal Claims
- Jones v Clinton – Issues of Suing Sitting President on National Security Programs
- Riley v California – A Warrant is Required to search a cell phone
- Carpenter v US – Case Appellant lobbied on behalf of Verizon to overturn Us v Q. Davis (11<sup>th</sup> Circuit 12-12928) which allowed warrantless search. (585 US \_ (2018))

### Federal Courts of Appeals: VERIZON CONTRACTING & NSC CASES

- Stritzinger v General Services Administration – 4<sup>th</sup> Circuit US Court of Appeals
- Stritzinger v Verizon – 5<sup>th</sup> Circuit US Court of Appeals
- Rivada Mercury v United States – DC District Court
- Kalyman v Obama – DC Court of appeals
- ACLU v Clapper – 2<sup>nd</sup> CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS
- Smith v Obama – Case Appellant entered in 9<sup>th</sup> circuit involving Verizon – Location processing.

### State Actions of Relevance: PERSONAL ISSUES INVOLVING J. STRITZINGER – CROSS-CLAIMS

- Stritzinger v Wright – Texas Supreme Court – 11-0224 – Dismissal of Dyslexia Case
- Stritzinger v Dollar – Florida Supreme Court – Dollar Rental Car Dismissal
- Stritzinger v Bank of America – NC Supreme Court – Dismissal of Claims of President Obama
- Meadowood Hospital v Stritzinger – Delaware Superior Court – Dismissal of WRS
- Maryland v Stritzinger – Circuit Court of Maryland – Dismissal of Rental Car Case
- Santen v Tuthill – Virginia Supreme Court – Powers of Circuit Courts
- Stritzinger v Verizon – Virginia Supreme Court – 16-1610 – Trial Not Commenced

## I. SUPPLEMENTAL FACTS (CONTINUATION OF PREVIOUS BRIEF)

Supplemental Facts for this brief include an Invoice to Verizon for his consolidated legal expenses as a result of Verizon refusing to represent him on a dispute with Mr. Obama, and

Office of the President of the United States, the States of Florida, Maryland, and Virginia all of which were originated by Samuel Asiedu, the former manager of Appellant in Ashburn Virginia. Mr. Asiedu spent approximately two days a week in the Federal Business office in Ashburn like Appellant, and Mr. Asiedu, and Mr. Stritzinger coordinated their schedules to get basic working conditions and work process status meetings. Otherwise all other Federal workers in sales at Verizon Federal were independent workers with very specific assignments. Since most Federal Business is contract work, evaluating Federal Bids, and responding to them can be done in most cases in any secure Verizon Facility including the Central Offices in Virginia, DC, Maryland, and Pennsylvania which both Mr. Asiedu, and Appellant shared and both were effective Federal Law Enforcement officers assigned to US Agencies and the Department of Defense. We are pretty confident it takes nearly a perfect life to make it to what is probably the most important engineering office in America as the Incumbent for the US government. It is second only to Appellants previous job at Bank of America, and an equivalent position at one of the other three major US Banks where Appellants peers work.

Mr. Asiedu entered effectively a criminal complaint with the State of Virginia which they found no evidence to support, then reported his rental car stolen to Dollar Rental car, before suspending him for his own action from work which a criminal trial proceeded on a National Security issue. The Virginia Magistrate believed the case was fact intensive, and could not be tried on a criminal warrant and set it for trial, as did three other General District Judges (Layne, Woolard, Chief Judge of the Circuit Court). However a Virginia Public Defender assigned to Appellant, refused to even check his employment, and without asking said the details were beyond her comprehension, and transferred him to a state hospital on a medical complaint she originated. The court overturned his own attorneys recommendations, and she has since been fired, but not before getting a fourth judge in the same Circuit to sign the transfer. The issue was Appellant asked his Virginia State Attorney to ask for an appearance in the US Army District Court in Norfolk due to the subject matter involved with his Verizon employment complaint, none of which Mr. Asiedu was cleared for by DHS, or Mr. Obama.

Mr. Obama had ordered Verizon to create a location processor for US Government Use in Federal Law Enforcement, and Protective services, and it needed to attach to the PSTN in North America and to other common carriers including ATT, Sprint, and T-Mobile. Mr. Obama at that point in time had all meta-data from all providers in the NSA's possession, so at the time, NSA data would have had to be transferred to Verizon Federal for processing in bulk. The ACLU then sued the US Government for bulk processing of location data which quite frankly is required for protective services, and counter-terror work, and Appellant believed the ACLU was committing treason in their litigation that they were not trained to understand, nor were ACLU lawyers willing to accept a briefing from Verizon on why they were wrong. The ACLU lawyers involved in his opinion were seeking additional high court admissions by litigating a case which they had no business being attached. (See Alex Abdo – ACLU – NY-NY). The issue was not CDR records as many news paper articles discussed, but the actual location records generated on the switch when cell phones register with their home, or roaming switches. These network admission, and re-admission records can be geocoded, and can be extended by real-time protocols which query the device for its GPS location. **As such network based**

protocols, and not smartphone based protocols can be determined to locate subscribers to an accuracy sufficient to detonate an explosive.

Multiple state judges with no telecommunications experience found it hard to believe that the PSTN can in fact process every record in real-time, even though they are well aware that every subscriber receives a bill every month with exactly this information (except overlay GPS phone information is usually not included but could be with minor modifications to billing systems).

Appellants research at Verizon was to extend this data to a Threat Manager, and a Case Manager for law enforcement so that the US Secret Service or FBI could query it in real time. Mr. Obama agreed to pay for US use of such a system, but Verizon might have to pay ATT, and Sprint for usage, and access to their networks, or use classified NSA data which required special contracts with the US Army. Verizon's CEO Lowell McAdam did not approve this work until a year after Appellant left the company, and only after a bid that Appellant wrote on his own time, and under his Company Greenville Associates was submitted to the GSA, and to Mr. Obama's office in approximately June of 2014 at which time Appellant traveled back to Virginia to deal with personal issues and a Verizon lawyer who sought to steal a child and his fiancé while the lawsuit was pending.

Three US District Judges (Leon, Wooten, and Yeakel) none of which are cleared for the project refused to transfer the case to FISA, or to the US Court of Appeals for the 4<sup>th</sup> Circuit, and would not write him a letter of introduction to the US Supreme Court Clerk. Furthermore, Appellant wrote to the office of US Senator Mark Warren (D) of Virginia and his staff after listening to his issue, told him the Senator would not assist, and recommended filing a complaint with the Bureau who also was not cleared except at the Director Level (Comey/Mueller). So at the present time, Petitioner believes that it would take Mr. Wray, Mr. Barr, or Mr. Trump personally to even entertain the issue outside of a US District Court, and Petitioner has asked and they have refused, and thus Petitioner believes the US Government needs to be ordered to appear.

Benjamin Torrance the US 2<sup>nd</sup> Circuit Appellate Manager for DOJ, who is appropriately qualified, and cleared has noted his complaint, but is complaining on quality of service in the district court, even though local rule 15 applies which is a dispute with a US Departmental Ruling, the Department in this case would be either the Whitehouse Executive Offices, or the National Intelligence Director (ClapperR) in a case he was already attached (2<sup>nd</sup> 14-42). The State of South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia cannot resolve the complaint which now has impacted four children, and Appellant believes six judges are now guilty of obstruction of Justice.

Appellant has contacted the US Attorney's office in Jacksonville Florida as he was instructed to do by the FBI hotline for Emergency issues. They asked Appellant to summarize classified issues, and their status, and they told Appellant that the issue was already resolved because Verizon had been awarded the bid, and had been paid. The issue is that Appellant has a sales compensation agreement, and under Virginia law refusal to pay was a felony by Mr. Asiedu.

This requires a federal MC style case, and only a Sr. District Judge can bind Mr. Obama to appear in any State or Federal Court on a National Security issue, as regular Federal Judges do not have appropriate clearances. Judge Wooten received Sr. Status only within the last two

or three months, and Judge Howard said he would only accept a criminal complaint against Mr. Obama or Verizon. In this case the criminal action would be against Patrick Blake hired by Verizon who is neither cleared, nor has any incentive to resolve the complaint because his client has been paid.

## **J. SUPPLEMENTAL ARGUMENTS**

### **Should Common Carriers & Financial Institutions Be Reimbursed for Electronic Records including Geocoding of the same?**

Yes. They should. It takes upwards of 2 hours per incident to locate, and respond to each record requested by a State, Local or Federal Government officer, and even longer for correlated record searches. Verizon should be paid a minimum of \$50.00 an hour for this service, or whatever contract Verizon Federal & Government Services has in place with the State in Question. To Appellants knowledge the State of South Carolina has no contract in place to request records from Verizon. This is relevant to the Business case and subsidies that Verizon might offer to local law enforcement if the US Government pays for the collection of a US-wide data store of 300M+ records. It is appellants position, and he believes he speaks for Verizon legal that we intend to enforce the US Supreme Court's ruling in Carpenter in every state and Federal Jurisdiction, but recognize this may take some time.

### **Do Local Law Enforcement Officers need a Warrant to Obtain Banking, and Telecommunications Records which positively determine the parties location. (See US Supreme Court Carpenter v US - 585 US \_ (2018))**

Yes. Local Law Enforcement officers are citizens of the United States of America, and thus must comply with US Supreme Court rules, along with their own state laws. Appellant recognizes however that knowledge of Federal Case law is likely not a training requirement for State Officers, and thus an order by this court would be relevant and timely. The impact to the two issues requested to Verizon is the ability to invoice State, and Federal Agencies for approximately 150M requests made in America every year. It is therefore a large business opportunity for Verizon Federal which was very expensive to win as Verizon had to make investments in time in money in Appellants work conditions which in some cases may take several years to get a return, this case being no exception.

Appellant requests the court order Verizon to provide a summary of the number of requests it gets every year, and how much it has charged for these services.

Capitol Technology Solutions of Annapolis, Maryland, Appellants new company which he is soon to launch and may be partially controlled by Verizon intends to have that as our target business in conjunction with Verizon Connect, our Federal and Military services for location processing and advanced communications for Fleets, and military vehicles.

## K. RELIEF REQUESTED

Appellant would like the court to find that South Carolina State agencies need to pay for location records, and that a warrant is required to request any data which positively determines the location of the party (Financial, or Telecommunications record. See Smith v Maryland (US Supreme Court - 1979 - 442 U.S. 735)

## L. PRAYER

Appellant prays for General Relief. Appellant prays the court orders the lower court to terminate all previous orders, and allow Appellant to return to his home State of Virginia or Texas as he sees fit.

Appellant prays for a Federal Jurisdictional Finding following oral argument.

Appellant prays for a remand to be a consolidated trial to be held by Judge Kelly in Greenville, by Judge Birch in his local courthouse, or a transfer to Rock Hill to the next available state magistrate empowered to try the case with a trial not to be less than one week, and not to exceed three weeks.


Appellant prays for findings on each of his questions submitted to this court, and for a remand for a Trial in Federal Court Preferably, or in a regional court outside of Columbia where a fair trial can be had.

Appellant requests that a criminal finding be entered against Judge Newman who he believes has bugged his home, his cell phone, his employers, and his workplace without grounds, and has been using County Resources to provide near full time surveillance. Furthermore, Appellant notifies the court that State officers are even seeking to interfere with his personal life on a daily basis, and may have even tried to medicate him without grounds using a location based behavioral health system which Verizon had developed before he left, and was in place in the entire state of Florida.

## M. CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The following document was served to the parties on 12/12/2019 as listed above by email, and facsimile to the addresses of record.

John S. Stritzinger /S



**VENDOR GREENVILLE ASSOCIATES SOLUTIONS  
PO BOX 1092 - MEDIA, PA 19063**

**THE SLOW PACE OF PROGRESS - LITIGATION PROCESSING IN AMERICA - ENHANCED METADATA**

**Timeline - 1/2011**  
**Legal Support Requirements - Location Services - Verizon Connect Extensions**  
**Date of Initiation**  
**Date of Termination**  
**ISSUE**  
**VALUE OF COMPLAINTS**  
**AMOUNTS DUE TO CLIENTS PERSONALLY**  
**CONTRACTS AWARDED ON DEPARTMENTAL SECURITY CLEARANCE TO DUE/FOUO/US-SECRET SERVICE**  
**CONTRACT TERM**  
**GREENVILLE ASSOCIATES & CAPITAL TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS ISSUES**  
**VERIZON SALES, AND EMPLOYEE AGREEMENTS & BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATE COMMITMENTS**

8/1/2013  
 16 YEARS + LITIGATION 2 MORE

STRATTON/STREITZINGER/ZELIKOFF

President Barack Obama ordered Verizon to provide a National Security Program (NSAP) to 2004 to a TRILLION DOLLARS TO VERIZON CORPORATION  
 OTHER CONGRESSIONAL BILL SALES TO DISC. ON ACQUISITION OF VERIZON BY DISC. BY LEGAMAN CEO OF VERIZON OF 420M DOLLARS. THEREAFTER, BANK OF AMERICA CHAIRMAN DID 2.8B FOR THE SAME WORKS.  
 VIDEO MANAGEMENT SYSTEM WITH LOCATION OVERLAY FOR FEDERAL BUREAU SECURITY, US SECRET SERVICE, PROTECTIVE SERVICES - ISSUED BY OBAMA ON HIS OWN ENHANCED THE REQUIREMENTS FOR A PUBLIC BID OFFLINE AND THEN SENT IT TO AWARD TO VERIZON.  
 15 YEARS TO VERIZON CONNECT. AT 7:00 A MONTH FOR OBTAINING BANDWIDTH (FOUO) - FULLY MANAGED - ATT FIRSTNET WAS 15 YEARS - VERIZON CONTRACT SHOULD BE HEAVILY BIDDING.  
 DEVELOPED AGREEMENTS TO PAY TO PROTECT COLLECTION (ABOUT 40 CORE PATENTED) AND 100 APPLICATIONS - EACH OF WHICH WAS PROVIDED TO VERIZON MANAGEMENT OPERATING IN MICROSOFT WORD, EXCEL, AND MICROSOFT DRAWING(S)  
 REQUIRE VERIZON TO COMPENSATE EMPLOYEES FOR LEGAL ISSUES ARISING OUT OF THIS EMPLOYMENT, FURTHERMORE THIS ISSUE WAS INSTAURATED AT BANK OF AMERICA WHEN STOCKEY/STREITZINGER ORDERED TO JOHN STRATTON ON NISTAC ROAD.

**LEGAL PROBLEMS**  
 PROBLEMS - NONDISCLOSURE - DC  
 PROBLEMS - ONGOING ACQU - LITIGATION  
 PROBLEMS - VERIZON CORPORATE STRUCTURE  
 PROBLEMS - VERIZON SPECIAL FINANCING FOR ITS PROGRAM  
 PROBLEMS - COMMERCIAL EMP NOT LISTED ON OBAMA NS PROGRAM  
 PROBLEMS - RECOVERY OF CAREER EXPENSES IMPACTS BUSINESS FINANCING  
 PROBLEMS - US DISTRICT COURT DENIED DAMAGES OVER FEES WHEN US GOVT OWED 200M DOLLARS  
 PROBLEMS - ORIGINAL JURISDICTION OF THE US SUPREME COURT UNDER ARTICLE II  
 PROBLEMS - FISA DENIED APPEARANCE IN WASHINGTON OR OHANNO ON APPOINTMENT  
 PROBLEMS - VERIZON AND BANK OF AMERICA HAVE SUPPLY CHAIN AGREEMENTS WHICH WERE BREACHED

US DISTRICT COURT (LEDN) DENIED INJUNCTION AT JUST ABOUT SAME TIME - SEPT OF 2013 - MAKING IT LEGAL TO COLLECT METADATA AT ALL  
 ACQU SALES US GOVERNMENT IN NEARLY EVERY STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTION BY FALL OF 2013 AT SAME TIME AS MR. OBAMA'S ORDERS MAKING BUSINESS CONDITIONS CLOUDY  
 VERIZON DID NOT OWN VERIZON WIRELESS UNTIL FALL OF 2014, AND COULD NOT COMPLETELY BUSINESS CASE WITHOUT WASHINGTON'S REWARD APPROVAL.  
 VERIZON DID NOT APPROVE KS WITH DHS UNTIL FALL OF 2014, A FULL YEAR AFTER LEAVING THE COMPANY AND ONLY AFTER EVALUATING THE INTERNAL BID  
 TRUMP ADMINISTRATION ISSUED ATT FIRSTNET BID BY COMMERCIAL DEPARTMENT - A PUBLIC OFFER OF VERIZON OF WHAT WAS ALREADY AWARDED TO VERIZON EFFECTIVELY IMPACTING THE STRUCTURE OF INFORMATION SERVICES PROVIDED  
 THERE IS A QUESTION ON WHETHER COMMON LAW IS REGULATED CAREERS CAN INVOKE LOCAL STATE AND FEDERAL CUSTOMERS FOR DIGITAL FOOTPRINTS REPORTS  
 US OFFERS DON'T HAVE TO PAY COURT FEES. BUT JUDGES WHEEL AND LEON REFUSED TO HEAR A SHOW CAUSE ON A NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAM INITIALLY. JUDGE WOODEN WANTED TO ARGUE OVER \$300.00 WHICH THE US GOVERNMENT OWED 200M. REFUSED TO DEFER DISCUSSION ON FEES TO FIRST HEARING.  
 CHIEF OF THE US SUPREME COURT REFUSED TO ALLOW AN ORIGINAL PETITION TO RESOLVE THE CAUSE WHICH WAS THE PRIMARY TOOL USED WHICH AND IF A FISA WARRANT WAS ISSUED, OTHER WORDS WERE THAT ROBERTS WAS AN ADVERSE PARTY TO THE PLAN BY OBAMA.  
 FISA LAWYERS SAID YOU LITERALLY HAVE TO WALK IN WITHOUT AN ID, AND REQUEST A SHOW CAUSE  
 VERIZON LAWYERS ASKED PETITIONER TO PROVIDE ENOUGH IDENTIFICATION AND APPLICABLE INFRASTRUCTURE OF BANK OF AMERICA TO VERIZON AS A REQUIREMENT TO START EMPLOYED.

Case No.	Case Title	Judge	Description	Federal/Judge	Status	Remarks
C300	Corporate Support	WILLIAM E STRITZINGER on behalf of Verizon	SUPERIOR CT	Complaint on NSA Used Metadata Involving JSS.	Delaware	Delaware Superior Court
C311	Corporate Support	Delaware v STRITZINGER	JUDGE ROBERTS	Complaint on NSA Use of Metadata Involving JSS.	Delaware	US Supreme Court - PERSONAL
C312	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon	JUDGE ROBERTS	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Delaware	US Supreme Court - PERSONAL
C313	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon	JUDGE ALITO	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Federal	2nd Cl. of Appeals
C314	Corporate Support	ACLU v Clapper	PANEL	Suit on Collection of Metadata/Records	Federal	9th Cl. of Appeals
C315	Corporate Support	Smith v Obama	PANEL	Suit on Collection of Metadata/Records	Federal	DC Cl. of Appeals
C316	Corporate Support	Klayman v Obama	PANEL	Suit on Collection of Metadata/Records	Federal	11th Cl. of Appeals
C317	Corporate Support	US v. Clapper	PANEL	Suit on Use of GPS for Criminal Process	Federal	US Supreme Court
C318	Corporate Support	US v. Clapper	PANEL	Suit on Use of GPS for Criminal Process	Federal	US Supreme Court
C319	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon	PANEL	Suit on Right to build Location Processor on US S&H - 50-200 Preliminary Patents, and Copyright	Federal	9th Circuit
C320	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon	YAKEL	Suit on Right to build Location Processor on US S&H - 50-200 Preliminary Patents, and Copyright	Federal	TEXAS WESTERN DISTRICT
C321	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon	YAKEL	Suit on Right to build Location Processor on US S&H - 50-200 Preliminary Patents, and Copyright	Federal	TEXAS WESTERN DISTRICT
C322	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon	PANEL	Disposition of Patents, Copyright	Federal	Federal Circuit of Appeals
C323	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon	PANEL	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Federal	US SUPREME COURT
C324	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon	PANEL	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Federal	3RD CIRCUIT CT OF APPEALS
C325	Corporate Support	Carpena v US (Combined)	FULL COURT	Review of Warrantless Use of GPS Tracking	Federal	Supreme Court of US
C326	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon	PEABODY PANEL	Review of Business Use of GPS Tracking, Sanitary	Federal	US District - Washington
C327	Corporate Support	RE JUDGE S. STRITZINGER v VERIZON	STAFF PANEL	Review of Labor Laws	Federal	US Supreme Court
C328	Corporate Support	Stritzinger, GAUS, CTS, Verizon US	KARLAN	Review of Collection Issues - Verizon Federal - Sale of IP	Federal	4th Circuit Court of Appeals
C329	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v USA	PANEL	Complaints from PA, MD, DC, SC, VA, TN, IN, OH, KY DENIED	Federal	US District - Washington
C330	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v USA	PANEL	Permanet requirement of GSA on Verizon, and US for Intellectual Property Seized by DHS.	Federal	US District - Washington
C331	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v United States	WOODHEAT	Review of Long Term Benefits Acquired to ISS For Federal Service.	Federal	SC US District Court
C332	Corporate Support	RE VERIZON v OBAMA	COFFMAN	Review of Contract Issued by Obama to Verizon	Federal	FISA - CHANDLER - JUDGE
C333	Corporate Support	RE VERIZON v OBAMA	SEAF/CEKE	Review of Contract Issued by Obama to Verizon	Federal	FISA - CLERK WASHINGTON
C334	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon, Dollar	PANEL	Rental Car, Legal Obligations of Verizon, IP	Florida	Florida 5th Circuit Court
C335	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon, Dollar	PANEL	Rental Car, Legal Obligations of Verizon, IP	Florida	Florida 5th Circuit Court
C336	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon, Dollar	PANEL	Rental Car, Legal Obligations of Verizon, IP	Florida	Florida 5th Circuit Court
C337	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon, Dollar	BERNARD	Rental Car, Legal Obligations of Verizon, IP	Florida	Florida 5th Circuit Court
C338	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon, Dollar	PANEL	Rental Car, Legal Obligations of Verizon, IP	Florida	Florida 5th Circuit Court
C339	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon, Dollar	PANEL	Rental Car, Legal Obligations of Verizon, IP	Florida	Florida 5th Circuit Court
C340	Corporate Support	RE JUDGE S. STRITZINGER v VERIZON	CHIEF LOVE	Review of Labor Laws	South Carolina	Court of Appeals SC
C341	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon, Dollar	KELLY, MOOD	Rental Car, Legal Obligations of Verizon, IP	South Carolina	Court of Appeals SC
C342	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon, Dollar	PANEL	Rental Car, Legal Obligations of Verizon, IP	South Carolina	Court of Appeals VA
C343	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon Federal	VANDUS - C. JUDGE	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	Court of Appeals VA
C344	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon Federal	PANEL	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	Court of Appeals VA
C345	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon Federal	PANEL	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C346	Corporate Support	Stritzinger v Verizon Federal	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington

**SUMMARY**

Case No.	Case Title	Judge	Description	Federal/Judge	Status	Remarks
C347	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C348	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C349	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C350	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C351	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C352	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C353	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C354	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C355	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C356	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C357	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C358	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C359	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C360	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C361	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C362	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C363	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C364	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C365	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C366	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C367	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C368	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C369	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C370	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C371	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C372	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C373	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C374	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C375	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C376	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C377	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C378	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C379	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C380	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C381	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C382	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C383	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C384	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C385	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C386	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C387	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C388	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C389	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C390	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C391	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C392	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C393	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C394	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C395	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C396	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C397	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C398	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C399	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C400	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington

**10 TOTAL CASES AND OVER 100 STATE AND FEDERAL ORDERS BECAUSE MR. ASHBY REFUSED TO ARBITRATE A CLAIM, AND ONCE MR. OBAMA HAD STOLEN WHAT HE WANTED FROM VERIZON - AN INFRASTRUCTURE TO GENERALLY PROCESS LOCATION IN CELLULAR SPACE.**

Case No.	Case Title	Judge	Description	Federal/Judge	Status	Remarks
C401	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C402	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C403	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C404	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C405	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C406	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C407	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C408	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C409	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C410	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C411	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C412	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C413	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C414	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C415	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C416	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C417	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C418	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C419	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C420	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C421	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C422	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C423	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C424	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C425	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C426	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C427	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C428	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C429	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C430	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C431	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C432	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C433	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C434	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C435	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C436	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C437	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C438	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C439	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C440	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C441	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C442	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C443	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C444	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C445	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C446	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C447	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF	Disposition of Intellectual Property Plan	Virginia	US District - Washington
C448	Corporate Support	Verizon v Stritzinger	STAFF			

