

No.:13M38

IN THE SUPREME COURT
OF THE UNITED STATES

United States of America,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Elizabeth Duke,

Defendant.

**Petition for Writ of Certiorari
to the
United States District Court
for the District of Columbia**

**Petitioner's Second Motion to Direct Clerk to File
Petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration and Clarification**

Montgomery Blair Sibley
Petitioner
4000 Massachusetts Ave, NW
Suite 1518
Washington, D.C. 20016
(202) 478-0371

Petitioner, Montgomery Blair Sibley (“Sibley”), respectfully requests that this Court direct the Clerk to file Sibley’s Motion for Reconsideration and Clarification, and for grounds in support thereof states as follows:

I. BACKGROUND

On **August 9, 2013**, Sibley deposited with the Clerk of this Court forty (40) Petitions for Writ of Certiorari.

On **August 13, 2013**, the Clerk refused to file the Petition. Sibley promptly made a motion to direct the Clerk to file the Petition. On **October 15, 2013**, this Court denied that Motion without explanation.

On **October 29, 2013**, the Clerk of this Court received Sibley’s Motion for Reconsideration and Clarification of the **October 15, 2013**, order in this matter. The same day, the Clerk rejected for filing Sibley’s Motion for Reconsideration. A copy of the letter rejecting the filing is attached hereto as Exhibit “A”.

II. REASONS FOR GRANTING THIS MOTION

The Court’s Rules neither allow nor prohibit the filing of a motion for reconsideration. Hence, there exists no authority for the Clerk to reject Sibley’s Motion for Reconsideration. To allow the Clerk to arbitrarily and capriciously decide whether the Court considers a proper presented pleading improperly delegates to the Clerk authority reserved solely to the Justices of this Court.

The rejection by the Clerk is particularly inappropriate in this matter given: (i) the irrefutable proof of Magistrate Judge Robinson’s commission of the felony found at 18 USC § 912 - *Officer or employee of the United States*, (ii) the impersonation by Magistrate Robinson of a federal district court judge, (iii) Magistrate Judge Robinson’s falsifying the record of the proceedings before her and

(iv) the preferential treatment given her drug dealing son by federal authorities as an apparent *quid pro quo* for improperly granting the Obama administration's curious demand to dismiss without explanation the indictment of the fugitive, domestic terrorist, Capitol bombing, Elizabeth Duke.

This Court can continue – as each and every judge of the District Court has below – to refuse to address these very serious allegations which go to the integrity of the entire judicial system. But know by doing so you and each of you will have destroyed the sacred trust placed in you by the People when you were granted life-tenure.

III. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, in so much as Sibley has properly presented in form a Motion for Reconsideration which properly invokes this Court's anomalous authority, this Court must forthwith direct the Clerk to file Sibley's Motion for Reconsideration.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing was served pursuant to U.S. First Class Mail Jay I. Bratt, Deputy Chief, National Security Section, U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia, United States Attorney's Office, 555 Fourth Street, NW, 10th Floor, Washington, DC 20530, (202) 252-7789), Jay.Bratt2@usdoj.gov this November 1, 2013.

MONTGOMERY BLAIR SIBLEY
Private Attorney General
4000 Massachusetts Ave, N.W.
Suite 1518
Washington, D.C. 20016
(202) 478-0371

By: _____
Montgomery Blair Sibley

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001

October 29, 2013

Montgomery B. Sibley
4000 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Apt. 1518
Washington, DC 20016-5136


RE: Montgomery Blair Sibley v. United States, et al.
No: 13M38

Dear Mr. Sibley:

The motion for reconsideration and clarification, received October 29, 2013, is herewith returned. On October 15, 2013, the motion to direct the Clerk to file a petition for a writ of certiorari was denied by the full Court without comment, which is the customary practice of the Court. No further explanation of the order is available. This case is considered closed in this Court, and no further consideration by this Court is possible.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk

By:


Jeffrey Atkins
(202) 479-3763

Enclosures

Exhibit "A"