UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT
AT SEATTLE

Douglas Vogt,

Petitioner,

vs.

United States District Court, Western District of Washington at Seattle,

Respondent.
_____/

Case No.:

PETITION FOR WRITS OF MANDAMUS

COMES NOW Douglas Vogt ("Vogt"), and prays that this Honorable Court grant the relief requested herein and states as follows:

I. THE RELIEF SOUGHT

By this Petition, Vogt seeks issuance of three writs of *mandamus* directed to Judge James L. Robart directing him to: (i) correct the docket in the District Court to accurately reflect the proceedings below, (ii) acknowledge Vogt's discharge of his obligations under the Misprision statutes, and (iii) in so much as the "public interest so requires", summon a grand jury to hear Vogt's forensic evidence which demonstrates that the Certificates of Live Birth ("COLBs") proffered by Barack Hussein Obama, II ("Obama") to prove his eligibility to be President are indisputably forgeries.

II. THE ISSUES PRESENTED

First, whether Judge Robart has violated his inherent duty to control his docket to preserve its integrity by permitting the Clerk to misrepresent the proceedings below and thereafter, though advised of the misrepresentation by Vogt, failing to correct the misrepresentation thereby undermining the Congressional purpose resident in 18 U.S.C. §2071(b) – "Concealment, removal, or mutilation generally".

Second, whether Vogt is entitled to an acknowledgment from Judge Robart that Vogt has discharged his obligations arising from 18 U.S.C. §4 – Misprision of Felony and/or 18 U.S.C. §2382 – Misprision of Treason.

Last, whether Judge Robart must, due to his abdication of the judicial function imposed upon him by Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 6(a), be ordered to summon a grand jury given that the forgery of Obama's COLBs is an issue "of great public importance".

III. THE FACTS NECESSARY TO UNDERSTAND THE ISSUES PRESENTED

On **October, 18, 2013**, Vogt presented to the Clerk for filing as a Miscellaneous matter a document captioned "*In Re: Douglas Vogt"* and titled: *"Notice of Commission of (i) a Felony Cognizable by a Court of the United States as required by 18 USC §4 -- Misprision of Felony and (ii) Treason against the United States as required by 18 USC § 2382 - Misprision of Treason and Motion to Seal*

Document" ("Notice of Commission" attached hereto as Exhibit "A"). Attached to the Notice of Commission was Vogt's publicly-available, 95-page affidavit in which he demonstrated forensically the existence of twenty (20) separate points of forgery in Obama's COLBs. In addition to the 95 page affidavit, Vogt also filed under seal a 75-page affidavit in which he identified the person who forged Obama's COLBs and traced those forgeries to Obama[1]. The matter was docketed as Case No.: C13-1880 and assigned to Judge Robart.

In the Notice of Commission, Vogt sought three actions from a federal district court judge: First, an acknowledgment that Vogt had discharged his obligations under the Misprision statutes. Second, that given the obvious "public interest" in preserving the integrity of the Office of the President from a pretender, the district court summon a grand jury to consider the public and sealed affidavits of Vogt. Last, that Vogt's sealed affidavit continue to be sealed from public view to prevent the spoilation of evidence that doubtlessly would occur if that affidavit were made public.

However, the Clerk did not accurately record the Notice of Commission on the docket. Instead, the Clerk renamed the Notice of Commission as "COMPLAINT against defendant(s)". Additionally, though Vogt had not sought to sue anyone, the

---

[1] Vogt would be pleased to provide a copy of the presently sealed affdivait upon request of the Court upon the condition that it remained sealed.

Clerk listed on the Docket as defendants all those referenced in the Notice of Commission. *See*: Docket attached hereto as Exhibit "B".

On **November 5, 2013**, Judge Robart issued his "Order to Show Cause Regarding Subject Matter Jurisdiction". That Order required Vogt to "show cause within 20 days of the date of this order why his complaint should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction." Notably, Judge Robart commenced the Order by misstating: "Before the court is Plaintiff Douglas Vogt's **complaint** in which he alleges that the certificates of live birth from the State of Hawaii that President Barack Obama has publicly released are forgeries." (Emphasis added). *See*: Exhibit "C" attached hereto.

In response, on **November 12, 2013**, Vogt filed his "Response to Order to Show Cause" in which he explicitly stated: "Vogt sought not to: (i) file a complaint, (ii) invoke the jurisdiction of the Court under Article III to resolve a "case" or "controversy", nor (iii) seek any relief against Barack Hussein Obama, II. . . . Moreover, while Vogt did not caption his Notice of Commission *Vogt v. Obama*, the Clerk – and now this Court – has done so. This misrepresentation of the record calls into question whether there has been a violation of 18 U.S.C. §2071(b) – Concealment, removal, or mutilation generally." Finally, Vogt again prayed that Judge Robart: "formally recognize that Vogt has discharged his duty under the

Misprision statutes" and "due to the 'public interest' in the allegations contained in Vogt's public affidavit and presently-sealed affidavit, superintend those affidavits to the Grand Jury for their consideration."

On **November 14, 2013**, Judge Robart entered his "Order Dismissing Complaint for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction". A copy of the Order is attached hereto as Exhibit "D". Judge Robart commenced his order by claiming: "Before the court is Plaintiff Douglas Vogt's **complaint** in which he alleges that the certificates of live birth from the State of Hawaii that President Barack Obama has publicly released are forgeries." (Emphasis added).

IV. THE REASONS WHY THE WRITS OF MANDAMUS SHOULD ISSUE

Vogt seeks to invoke this Court's so-called supervisory and advisory *mandamus* power arising under the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. §1651(a). This model of appellate mandamus is properly invoked when a district court's behavior amounts "to little less than an abdication of the judicial function . . ." *La Buy v. Howes Leather Co.*, 352 US 249, 255 (1957). Supervisory mandamus thus serves a "corrective and didactic function." *Will v. United States*, 389 U.S. 90, 107 (1967). Finally, the Supreme Court has recognized that mandamus is a proper remedy to supervise district court practices (*Mallard v. U.S. Dist. Court*, 490 U.S. 296, 309-10 (1989)) and when petitioners demonstrate a "clear abuse of discretion" (*Bankers Life*

& Casualty Co. v. Holland, 346 U. S. 379, 383 (1953)).[2]

Against this variously-defined reach of the writ of mandamus, the record below demonstrates in three separate instances that this Court must issue the writ to compel Judge Robart to: (i) correct the docket, (ii) acknowledge Vogt's "making known" felonies to the district court and (iii) summon a grand jury. In each instance "it is his duty to do so." *Ex parte Peru*, 318 U.S. 578, 583 (1943), *Roche v. Evaporated Milk Assn.*, 319 U.S. 21, 26 (1943).

A. JUDGE ROBART FAILED TO PRESERVE THE INTEGRITY OF THE DOCKET IN CASE NO.: C13-1880

"A court has the inherent power and duty to control its docket, to preserve its integrity, and to insure that the legislation administered by the court will accomplish the legislative purpose." *Matter of Nikron, Inc.*, 27 Bankr. 773, 777 (E.D. Mich. S.D. 1983). To that end, a court has: "general supervisory power to administer its docket and preserve the integrity of the judicial process." *U. S. v. Goodson*, 204 F.3d 508,

---

[2] The Circuit Courts have justified employing mandamus is other circumstances as well. *See: In re Asbestos Sch. Litig.*, 46F.3d 1284, 1288(3rd Cir. 1994)("Mandamus may be especially appropriate to further supervisory and instructional goals, and where issues are unsettled and important."); *United States v. Bertoli*, 994 F.2d 1002, 1014 (3rd Cir. 1993) (noting that mandamus review is appropriate "when fundamental undecided issues . . . implicate not only the parties' interests but those of the judicial system itself"); *In re Société Nationale Industrielle Aérospatiale*, 782 F.2d 120, 123 (8th Cir. 1986)("[M]andamus review may be appropriate to provide guidelines for the resolution of novel and important questions . . . that are likely to recur."), *vacated on other grounds sub nom.*, 482 U.S. 522 (1987).

514 (4th Cir. 2000). Moreover, it is a felony under 18 U.S.C. §2071(b)[3] to "falsify" a court record as here the Clerk and Judge Robart have done in Case No.: C13-1880.

Yet this is exactly what Judge Robart did when he – despite being expressly advised by Vogt of the Clerk's falsification – continued to maintain that Vogt had filed a "complaint" and employed the caption *Douglas Vogt vs. Barack Obama, et al.* in his orders.

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 3 "Commencing an Action" states: "A civil action is commenced by filing a complaint with the court." Vogt did not file a "complaint". Moreover, to publicly caption Vogt's discharge of his Misprision duties and request for grand jury investigation as a *de facto* frivolous lawsuit against Barack Hussein Obama puts Vogt in an actionable "false public light", while – given the absolute judicial immunity enjoyed by the federal courts and their clerks – Vogt is left without civil redress for this apparent intentional libel.

Accordingly, as Judge Robart has breached his "duty" to maintain the integrity of his docket – if not committed a felony – this Court must issue its writ of *mandamus*

---

[3] "Whoever, having the custody of any such record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, or other thing, willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, falsifies, or destroys the same, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both; and shall forfeit his office and be disqualified from holding any office under the United States. As used in this subsection, the term "office" does not include the office held by any person as a retired officer of the Armed Forces of the United States."

directing Judge Robart to correct the Docket in C13-1880 to reflect the actual title of the Notice of Commission filed by Vogt.

B. JUDGE ROBART FAILED TO ACKNOWLEDGE VOGT'S "MAKING KNOWN" A FELONY COGNIZABLE BY THE DISTRICT COURT

There has been a federal statutory crime of misprision of felony since 1790. Now codified at 18 U.S.C. §4, it currently reads: "Whoever, having knowledge of the actual commission of a felony cognizable by a court of the United States, conceals and does not as soon as possible make known the same to some judge or other person in civil or military authority under the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both."

Likewise, 18 U.S.C. §2382 – Misprision of Treason states: "Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States and having knowledge of the commission of any treason against them, conceals and does not, as soon as may be, disclose and make known the same . . . to some judge of the United States . . . is guilty of misprision of treason and shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than seven years, or both."

These statutes codify the long-standing common law tradition to raise the "hue and cry". In *Roberts v. United States*, 445 U.S. 552, 558 (1980) the Supreme Court stated that "gross indifference to the duty to report known criminal behavior remains

a badge of irresponsible citizenship."

Accordingly, Vogt "made known" to a judge of the United States the commission of felonies and treasons as he is obligated to do under pain of criminal sanction. Yet, where is the proof of his required action? Only the Clerk was served with the pleadings which sought to discharge Vogt's misprision obligation and the Clerk misrepresented on the docket Vogt's required notice. Upon assignment to Judge Robart, he had a "duty" to acknowledge that he had received that which Vogt had filed. Simply stated, Vogt deserves a formal acknowledgment from the District Court of the duty that Congress has imposed upon it pursuant to the Misprision statues.

Congress has in other areas obligated Article III judges to perform public functions beyond their duty to resolve Article III "cases" and "controversies". For example, Congress obligated judges at 8 U.S.C. §1448(a) to administer the "Oath of renunciation and allegiance" during naturalization proceedings. Indeed, upon administering such an Oath, the Court is obligated to provide the oath-taker with a certificate attesting that the Oath was taken. *See*: Title 22 C.F.R. §50.10 "Certificate of nationality." Would any doubt that a writ of *mandamus* would lie to compel a judge to issue such a certificate if he/she refused to do so?

Thus, in Naturalization proceedings Congress has imposed upon the "inferior"

Article III courts the obligation to acknowledge the taking of an oath. Analogously then, Congress has imposed a similar obligation upon a federal judge to acknowledge the "making known" of the commission of felonies and treasons. This "duty" of a district court judge has here been breached as Judge Robart has failed to so acknowledge Vogt's Notice of Commission.

Accordingly, for failing to discharge his "duty" in this regard, this Court must issue its writ of *mandamus* to compel Judge Robart to acknowledge Vogt's "making known" to him the felonies and treasons identified in Vogt's Notice of Commission.

C. JUDGE ROBART FAILED TO SUMMON A GRAND JURY THOUGH OBLIGATED TO DO SO

Judge Robart has the obligation to summon a grand jury when, as he was below, apprised of evidence that establishes that it is in the "public interest" for a grand jury to investigate. Here, given the implications of a President whose essential credentials to hold that high office are demonstrably forged, society's interest is best served by a thorough and extensive investigation that only the grand jury can undertake. Hence for Judge Robart to refuse to summon a grand jury upon his *de facto* if not *de jure* receipt of Vogt's public and sealed affidavits is a "clear abdication of the judicial function" thereby obligating this Court to issue it's writ of *mandamus* to so compel Judge Robart.

1. THE DUTY TO SUMMON A GRAND JURY

Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 6(a) states: "When the **public interest so requires**, the court **must order** that one or more grand juries be summoned." (Emphasis added). Thus, there is no discretion in the District Court to bring or not bring to the attention of a Grand Jury evidence of criminal behavior when the "public interest" demands Grand Jury action. Noteworthy is the Supreme Court, upon the delegation from and approval of Congress[4], enacted Rule 6 in 1946.

Congress has at 18 U.S.C. §3332(a) additionally imposed the right of a district court judge to refer matters to the Grand Jury: "Such alleged offenses **may be brought to the attention of the grand jury by the court** or by any attorney appearing on behalf of the United States for the presentation of evidence." (Emphasis added).[5]

---

[4] These rules of criminal procedure were prescribed under the authority of an act of Congress, namely: the Act of June 29, 1940, c. 445 (Proceedings in criminal cases prior to and including verdict; power of Supreme Court to prescribe rules). The Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure took effect on March 21, 1946.

[5] Yet the access to the Grand Jury that Congress sought to secure to the People in enacting §3332(a) has been judicially-eviscerated. In *Sibley v. Obama et al*, Case No: 12-cv-001(D.C. Dist. Ct. 2012); *summarily affirmed*, Case No.: 12-5198 (D.C. Cir. 2012); *cert. den*. Case No.: 12-736 (2013) the court held: "The Court will deny the mandamus request, in keeping with prior decisions that 18 U.S.C. §3332 cannot be enforced by private individuals." While §3332 obligates the U.S. Attorney to present evidence to the grand jury if requested by a Citizen – as Vogt has done here – there is now **no** legal right to enforce that obligation rendering it aspirational only.

Vogt notes to the Court that this issue of the Rule 6(a) obligation to summon a grand jury is a question-of-first-impression as the "summon" duty found in Rule 6(a) has not been judicially interpreted by any court.[6] Hence, give the significance of the Grand Jury's essential role in our Federal System coupled with the important issues raised by Vogt's affidavits, this matter demands full consideration by and oral argument before the Court in its decision in this matter.

Accordingly, it cannot be gainsaid that Judge Robart had a clear duty to summon a grand jury if "the public interest so" required.[7]

---

[6] Vogt notes that in *U.S. v. Hon. Judge Almeric L. Christian*, 660 F.2d 892, 902 (3rd Cir. 1981), the Court – while addressing the scope of Rule 6(a) – only did so in the context of that Rule's applicability to the territory of the U.S. Virgin Islands holding: "We must, therefore, defer to the Virgin Islands' legislature or the United States Congress to authorize for the Virgin Islands such grand juries as are deemed appropriate."

[7] Vogt is not *jejune* to the singular case which held: "Authority to convene or discharge grand jury is vested in District Court; its exercise of its discretion to convene, or not to convene, special grand jury, or to discharge grand jury, is not reviewable on appeal, and Court of Appeals cannot by mandamus, or any other extraordinary writ, inject itself into discretionary area reserved to District Court. *Petition of A & H Transp., Inc.* 319 F2d 69 (4th Cir. 1963), *cert den.,* 375 US 924 (1963). Yet for the *stare decisis* cited to conclude that *mandamus* was not available to compel a district court to summon a grand jury, the *per curiam* opinion cited only two cases: *In re Texas Co.*, 201 F.2d 177 (D.C. Cir. 1952) and *Morris v. United States*, 128 F.2d 912 (5th Cir. 1942). In the former, the holding was extremely limited to the issue of discharging, not summoning, a grand jury. "If any court has discretion to discharge this grand jury which is not shown to be ineligible, before any indictment is returned, a question as to which we imply no opinion, it is the District Court. We cannot invade any such discretion with the extraordinary writ of mandamus." *In re*

2. THE ROLE OF THE GRAND JURY IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S COMPACT WITH THE PEOPLE

In order to put the Rule 6(a) "public interest" standard in context it is instructional to start by reviewing the peculiar role of the federal grand jury in the Constitutional compact the People made with their federal government. As noted by this Court in *U.S. v. Navarro-Vargas*, 408 F.3d 1184, 1192 (9th Cir. 2005):

> As the Revolutionary War drew closer, the grand jury became popular "at least as much from its success as a political weapon as from its role in the criminal justice system." Leipold, 80 CORNELL L. REV. at 285. Colonial grand juries publicly called for boycotts of British goods, condemned British rule, criticized the use of the tea tax to pay British officials' salaries, and indicted British soldiers for breaking and entering into the homes of private citizens. . . .In their presentments, colonial grand juries reported on matters of public interest and criticized public agencies or officials.

Additionally, as detailed for the majority in *U.S. v. Williams*, 504 U.S. 36, 47

Texas Co. at 179. As to the latter, the issue of *mandamus* was not addressed on that appeal and in all other respect the citation in *Petition of A & H Transp.* to *Morris v. United States* is a *non-sequitur*. Hence, both *In re Texas Co.* and *Morris v. United States* are inapposite for the question raised herein.

Moreover, the Court in *U.S. v. United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia*, 238 F.2d 713, 719 (4th Cir. 1956) held that it had such *mandamus* authority: "We think that as grand jury investigations relate to matters potentially within our appellate jurisdiction, we have jurisdiction under the 'all writs' statute to issue writs of mandamus to correct errors or abuses of discretion on the part of the district judge in dealing with such investigations."

(1992), Justice Scalia observed:

> Rooted in long centuries of Anglo-American history, the grand jury is mentioned in the Bill of Rights, but not in the body of the Constitution. It has not been textually assigned, therefore, to any of the branches described in the first three Articles. It "is a constitutional fixture in its own right." In fact the whole theory of its function is that it belongs to no branch of the institutional Government, serving as a kind of buffer or referee between the Government and the people. (Citations omitted).

Finally, "the grand jury has been accorded wide latitude to inquire into violations of criminal law. No judge presides to monitor its proceedings. It deliberates in secret and may **determine alone the course of its inquiry**. The grand jury may compel the production of evidence or the testimony of witnesses as it considers appropriate, and its operation generally is unrestrained by the technical procedural and evidentiary rules governing the conduct of criminal trials." *U. S. v. Calandra*, 414 U.S. 338, 343 (1974)(Emphasis added).

In sum, the federal grand jury serves a vital role in policing the social compact between the People and the federal government they created. Thus, where, as here, the forensic evidence of the forgery of the President's Certificates of Live Birth are properly presented, it is to the Grand Jury – not an Article III judge – alone that the Constitutional delegation of authority to investigate is consigned. To hold otherwise, i.e., that the President's appointed Attorney General should vested with the sole

discretion to investigate such an allegation, is, of course, absurd and an insult to the People.

3. THE PUBLIC INTEREST COMPELS THE SUMMONING OF A GRAND JURY AND JUDGE ROBART'S REFUSAL TO DO SO IS A BREACH OF HIS CLEAR DUTY

Vogt emphatically maintains that there can be no higher "public interest" than the pressing issue of whether Barack Hussein Obama, II, has foisted forged Certificates of Live Birth upon the Citizens of the United States as indisputably detailed in Vogt's public affidavit. The only possible conclusion for such an action is that Barack Hussein Obama, II is not a United States citizen and therefore had to have a forged birth certificates created in order to run for public office. Since he has not proven citizenship he is not entitled to occupy the office of the President. Coupled with the clear circumstantial evidence contained in Vogt's sealed affidavit which links Barack Hussein Obama, II with the forger of his putative Certificates of Live Birth, the "public interest" in having these matters determined is overwhelming.

To deny to the Grand Jury the opportunity to determine on behalf of the People whether to investigate Vogt's allegations or not as only the Grand Jury can confirms Justice Douglas observation that it is: "common knowledge that the Grand Jury, having been conceived as a bulwark between the citizen and the Government, is now a tool of the Executive." *United States v. Dioniso*, 410 U.S. 19, 23 (1973)(Douglas,

J., dissenting). The loss of the Grand Jury in this instance in its traditional, authentic, or runaway form, leaves the modern federal government with few natural enemies capable of delivering any sort of damaging blows against it.[8] Simply stated, by statute, rule and case law, the Grand Jury has been emasculated in what can only be viewed as an absolute *coup d'etat* upon the Grand Jury by the federal government. The last remaining vestige then of Citizen access to the Grand Jury now resides in the District Court's Rule 6(a) obligation to summon a grand jury: "When the public interest so requires . . .".

What is that compelling evidence which triggers the obligation of Judge Robart to summon a grand jury? It starts with Obama. At his Press Conference on April 27, 2011, Obama made the following statement regarding his Long Form Certificate of Live Birth:

---

[8] "In 1946, the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure were adopted, codifying what had previously been a vastly divergent set of common law procedural rules and regional customs. . . In the area of federal grand jury practice, however, a remarkable exception was allowed. The drafters of Rules 6 and 7, which loosely govern federal grand juries, denied future generations of what had been the well-recognized powers of common law grand juries: powers of unrestrained investigation and of independent declaration of findings. The committee that drafted the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure provided no outlet for any document other than a prosecutor-signed indictment. In so doing, the drafters at least tacitly, if not affirmatively, opted to ignore explicit constitutional language." Creighton Law Review, Vol. 33, No. 4, 1999-2000, 821, *If It's Not a Runaway, It's Not a Real Grand Jury* by Roger Roots, J.D.

> As many of you have been briefed, we provided additional information today about the site of my birth. Now, this issue has been going on for two, two and a half years now. I think it started during the campaign. And I have to say that over the last two and a half years I have watched with bemusement, I've been puzzled at the degree to which this thing just kept on going. We've had every official in Hawaii, Democrat and Republican, every news outlet that has investigated this, confirm that, yes, in fact, I was born in Hawaii, August 4, 1961, in Kapiolani Hospital. We've posted the certification that is given by the state of Hawaii on the Internet for everybody to see.[9]

Plainly, Obama has publicly "owned" his COLBs. Yet, as fully detailed in the Notice of Commission, there are twenty (20) distinct points of forgery contained in the COLBs. Moreover, the Notice of Commission identifies the numerous federal felonies implicated by a forged COLB. Finally, detailed in Vogt's presently-sealed affidavit is a detailed analysis which reveals the names of the forger and his/her accomplices and links those individuals directly to Obama and his April 27, 2011, Press Conference.

Stated another way, to refuse to let the Grand Jury see and evaluate the evidence contained in Vogt's affidavits is to become an accessory-after-the-fact to what plausibly is the largest fraud ever to occur in the United States with potentially devastating implications for the security of the Union. Indeed, what harm is

---

[9] Retrieved from: http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2011/04/27/remarks-president

occasioned by letting the Grand Jury decide – as is its Constitutional right and duty – as to what course of action it deems appropriate upon review of Vogt's affidavits?

V. CONCLUSION

As Justice Jackson observed in *Terminiello v. Chicago*, 337 U.S. 1, 37 (1949) "The Constitution is not a suicide pact." To now construe that Constitution to conclude that the Executive can block access to the Grand Jury with the fawning compliance of the Judiciary to the end of subverting the express requirement of Article II that the President be a citizen of the United States is an absurd and insulting result. The People never contracted to abdicate: "the right, possessed by every citizen, to require that the Government be administered according to law. . . ." *Fairchild v. Hughes*, 258 U.S. 126, 130 (1922).

WHEREFORE, upon the foregoing, Vogt respectfully prays that this Court issues it's writs of *mandamus* to compel Judge Robart to: (i) correct the docket in the District Court to accurately reflect the proceedings below, (ii) acknowledge Vogt's discharge of his obligations under the Misprision statutes, and (iii) in so much as the "public interest so requires", summon a grand jury to hear Vogt's forensic evidence which demonstrates that the Certificates of Live Birth ("COLBs") proffered by Barack Hussein Obama ("Obama") to prove his eligibility to be President are indisputably forgeries.

CERTIFICATE OF RELATED CASES

Pursuant to Circuit Rule 28-2.6., Vogt certifies that there are no other cases in this Court that can be deemed related.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and accurate copy of foregoing was served without Exhibits by U.S. First Class Mail upon the Honorable Judge James L. Robart, U.S. District Court, 700 Stewart Street, Suite 2310, Seattle, WA 98101 this ___ day of November, 2013..

DOUGLAS VOGT
Petitioner
12819 S.E. 38th Street, #115
Bellevue, WA 98006
Telephone number: 425-643-1131
Email Address: Doug@vectorpub.com

By: _____
Douglas Vogt