

Dr. Orly Taitz, ESQ.
29839 Santa Margarita Parkway, Ste. 100
Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688
Ph 949-683-5411 F949-766-7603
Orly.Taitz@gmail.com
CA Bar License 223433
Pro Hac Vice GA
Attorney For Petitioners

OFFICE OF STATE ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF GEORGIA

DAVID FARRAR,	:	
LEAH LAX,	:	
CODY ROBERT JUDY,	:	DOCKET #: OSAH-SECSTATE-
THOMAS MacLAREN	:	CE-1215136-60-MALIHI
LAURIE ROTH	:	
	:	
Plaintiffs,	:	OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO QUASH
	:	SUBPOENAS
v.	:	
	:	
	:	
BARACK OBAMA	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	
_____	:	

Plaintiffs herein oppose motion to quash subpoenas as one with no merit and utterly frivolous. Motion is loaded with irrelevant material, represents mostly an attack on the Plaintiffs' counsel and an attempt to prejudice the court against

Plaintiffs counsel. Motion is vague and does not present any specific recognized justifiable reasons to quash the subpoena. Motion should be denied as one without merit and frivolous.

ARGUMENT

1. Defendant starts by stating that the hearing would require him to interrupt his duties in order to appear for an administrative hearing in Fulton County GA. It is noteworthy, that this statement comes on the heels of his extended 17 day Hawaiian vacation, which cost U.S. taxpayers 4 million dollars. Mr. Obama has earned a dubious distinction as a Vacationer in Chief, Tourist in Chief, Partier in Chief and a Golfer in Chief due to his endless vacations, parties and rounds of golf. Considering all of the above, it is not too much to ask for Mr. Obama to show up once at a hearing and present his original identification records, which were not seen by anyone in the country yet.
2. Significance of the trial in Fulton county GA has repercussions on the nation as a whole as surely finding of this trial will affect decisions around the country, as other states will need to ascertain, whether to allow Mr. Obama on the ballot as an eligible candidate.
3. Defendant states that he "made document available to the general public by placing it on his web site". Since when is an image posted on line, on a website, represents a document, admissible in a court of law or anywhere else for that

matter? When U.S. citizens are applying for their passports or drivers licenses, do they tell the clerk at the counter to look on their website at something they drew two days ago and posted yesterday? One can post a laundry list on a website and call it a birth certificate. To get a job as a janitor at the White House or anywhere else for that matter you need to show actual documents. Unfortunately, in most states in the nation and in the federal government there is a loop hole, whereby individuals running for high offices such as Senator or President can get into such office without ever showing any documents. It is an honor system, it was presumed, that one would not dare to run for such a high office without possessing necessary documents. However, as was shown in exhibits provided with the First Amended Complaint, there is evidence of fraud and forgery in Mr. Obama's identification records, such as his alleged long form birth certificate and Social Security number, which necessitates the need for subpoena for a certified long form birth certificate to be produced by Mr. Obama as well as the original to be produced by the Director of Health of Hawaii Loretta Fuddy.

3. Motion to quash is vague and ambiguous. It is titled "Motion to Quash Subpoenas" plural, however in the body of the motion he talks about "a subpoena", singular. Mr. Obama does not represent any witnesses; his attorney does not represent any witnesses. No other party filed any motions to quash. If any of the witnesses do not want to appear at trial, it is up to them to file motions to quash. As

a matter of fact, recently retired Senior Deportation Officer with the Department of Homeland Security John Sampson and licensed investigator Susan Daniels, witnesses mentioned by Mr. Obama, stated that they want to testify to evidence of fraud in Mr. Obama's identification records, as they feel this is the most important matter of the national security. Plaintiffs' attorney has already spent thousands of dollars on airfare and hotel reservations in order to bring the witnesses to trial. Defendant did not provide any specific justification for quashing subpoenas served on other parties.

4. Mr. Obama was properly served with the subpoena in the state of Georgia, through his attorney Mr. Michael Jablonski, located at 260 Brighton road , N..E. Atlanta, GA 30309. Unless the city of Atlanta recently seceded from the state of Georgia, Mr. Obama was served in the state of Georgia, subpoena is procedurally valid and Mr. Obama needs to comply, appear at trial and produce the documents requested.

5. Mr. Obama availed himself to the jurisdiction of the state of Georgia and this court by virtue of submitting his candidacy for presidency. Being a candidate is time consuming. Mr. Obama recently embarked on a campaign bus tour across Mid West and he is flying around the country attending multiple fundraisers in order to build a cash war chest for the general election. Campaigning consists of not only meeting with large donors and seeking donations, but also of proving that

one is eligible for the position and has proper identification papers, particularly since no one saw the original documents and an alleged copy is deemed to be a forgery. It is reasonable to seek subpoena for Mr. Obama to appear at trial and provide identification papers. Most of the arguments in this motion are redundant and were brought in Defendant's motion to dismiss. It was denied. Defendant is under jurisdiction of the court and agreed to service of process in the state of Georgia through his attorney, who is located in Georgia. Service of subpoena was proper and valid.

6. Rules of the administrative court of GA state:

616-1-2-19

(1) Subpoenas may be issued which require the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of objects at depositions or hearings provided by these Rules...

616-1-2-19

(5) A subpoena may be quashed by Administrative law Judge if it appears that the subpoena is **unreasonable or oppressive or that the objects sought are irrelevant, immaterial or cumulative and unnecessary** to a party's preparation and presentation of its position or that **basic fairness dictates that subpoena should not be enforced... (Emphasis added) Ga. Comp. R and regulations 616-1-2-.19(5)**

Subpoena, served on Mr. Obama through his attorney is attached as Exhibit 1.

It requests any and all certified birth records, certified long form birth certificate, certified school/university registration records, certified immigration/naturalization records, certified passport records and redacted certified SS-5 application under the names Barack(Barry) Soetoro, Barrack (Barry) Soebarkah and Barack (Barry) Obama and any and all combination of thereof and any other names used.

First, let's look at the names. Plaintiffs provided the court with recently released passport records of Barack Obama's mother, Ann Dunham (Obama) Soetoro (Exhibit 2). In her passport records Barack Obama was listed under the last name Soebarkah. In south Asia it is common to create blended names. Apparently his mother and Indonesian step father blended his first name Barack and his step father's last name and created a blended last name, Soebarkah. In his school registration #203 from Assissi School in Jakarta Indonesia he is listed under the last name Soetoro. Nobody ever saw any identification documents of Barack Obama, and we do not even know if Barack Obama is his legal name. It is not unreasonable, irrelevant, immaterial, cumulative, unfair or oppressive to seek to see identification papers to ascertain, if there is a legal entity Barack Obama, to ascertain, whether a man, who seeks to be on the ballot is Barack Obama.

b. The issue of Obama's eligibility was never adjudicated on the merits. As eligibility questions were raised and polls were showing that some 70% of voters doubted his eligibility, in April of 2011 Mr. Obama posted on the internet, what he claimed to be a copy of his long form birth certificate. Affidavits by Felicito Papa (Exhibit 4), Douglas Vogt and Paul Ireby attested to the fact, that according to their experience in the field of Adobe Illustrator, Typesetting and scanning, what was posted on the Internet, was not a copy of a document, but a forgery, created by cutting and pasting parts of different documents and filling in the blanks with computer graphics. Mr. Obama and White House counsel Kathy Ruemmler refused to present for examination the certified copy allegedly obtained in Hawaii. Director of Health of Hawaii refused to produce for examination the original document and nobody even knows whether the alleged 1961 original aged document even exists. If it existed, there was no reason to create a computer generated forgery. As such it is reasonable to seek from the defendant Mr. Obama to provide a valid certified copy of the long form birth certificate and to subpoena from the state of Hawaii the original document for examination. Moreover, Mr. Obama has posted his alleged birth certificate on mugs and T-shirts; he taunted the plaintiffs and their attorney. After he posted his alleged long form birth certificate on line, on mugs and T-shirts, he cannot claim privacy, department

of Health cannot claim privacy, it is not unreasonable, unfair, cumulative, oppressive, immaterial, or unnecessary to subpoena production of a certified copy of the long form birth certificate in lieu of the alleged copy made public and in light of the reports of the alleged copy being a forgery.

c. Considering the fact that in his Indonesian school records, Mr. Obama is listed as an Indonesian National, it is reasonable to subpoena his Immigration/Naturalization records and passport records. If indeed he came back from Indonesia as an Indonesian national and had to go through immigration/naturalization proceedings, he would be a naturalized citizen, not natural born and would not qualify for the position of the U.S. President, as the U.S. President is supposed to be Natural born. Similarly, it is reasonable to subpoena his school registration records, as those would reflect his legal name and citizenship. As such, immigration records, passport records and school registration records are not immaterial, unnecessary, cumulative, oppressive, unfair, unreasonable or irrelevant to be requested in the subpoena.

d. Lastly, as Mr. Obama published his tax records, he did not flatten the PDF file. His full Social Security number became available to the public, which was a Connecticut Social Security number, even though Mr. Obama was never a resident of CT and the number was never assigned to Barack Obama according to E-Verify and SSNVS. Individuals, who are natural born citizens,

have no problem obtaining a valid Social Security number from the state, where they reside. Lack of a valid Social Security number is evidence of identity fraud. As such, subpoena of a redacted SS-5 is not immaterial, irrelevant, oppressive, cumulative, unreasonable, irrelevant, unnecessary or unfair.

Based on all of the above, all the documents requested in the subpoena were properly requested and there are no grounds to quash the subpoena, seeking production of the above documents.

7. Most of the motion to quash contains irrelevant, impertinent, inflammatory and prejudicial material, which has nothing to do with the motion to quash the subpoena and was brought improperly, with the sole purpose of obfuscating the issues and prejudicing the court against the Plaintiffs and their attorney.

Defendant is bringing unrelated cases. It is, suffice to say, that not one single eligibility case was heard on the merits. Not one single judge around the nation ruled that Barack Obama is a natural born citizen. Not one single judge around the nation saw Obama's long form birth certificate, not one single judge ruled that Barack Obama has a valid long form birth certificate, not one single judge ruled that Barack Obama has a valid Social Security number. Not one single judge ruled that Barack Obama is indeed his legal name. Not one single judge ruled that the person residing in the White House is indeed

Barack Obama. All of the cases brought after the 2008 election were dismissed on technicality: due to lack of jurisdiction, lack of standing or court's desire to abstain from hearing the issue. Previous cases were adjudicated after the election and judges did not want to overturn the results of the election. Current case is different in that it is brought as a ballot challenge; it is being heard before the primary, before Mr. Obama's name is on the ballot. Defendant is bringing forward the fact that Mr. Obama was elected and confirmed in 2008. This is irrelevant. We are not in 2008. We are in 2012. Since 2008 a lot of information became available, which showed forgery and fraud in Mr. Obama's records.

An old axiom states, if you don't like the message, kill the messenger. The defense engaged in attacking the Plaintiffs' counsel. This motion is not about the Plaintiffs' counsel. This motion is about the subpoena. Were the documents properly requested in the subpoena? The defense was supposed to address each document requested and show with specificity, why there is legal basis to quash this particular document. Defendant failed to do so, as the documents requested were relevant, material, reasonable, necessary, not cumulative, not oppressive and do not violate the notion of fairness. Gratuitous attack on Plaintiffs' counsel, bringing unrelated cases and irrelevant matters in the motion to quash was unethical and sanctionable.

CONCLUSION

The subpoena served on Defendant was proper, documents requested not irrelevant, immaterial, unreasonable, oppressive, and cumulative and did not violate the notion of fairness. As such the Motion to Quash Subpoena served on the Defendant should be denied.

Proof of service

I, Orly Taitz, ESQ attest that I served this Opposition to Motion to Quash Subpoena on the defendant on 01.19.2012 through his attorney at Michael.Jablonski@comcast.net

/s/ Dr. Orly Taitz, ESQ