Dr. Orly Taitz, ESQ

29839 Santa Margarita Parkway, STE 100

Rancho Santa Margarita CA 92688

Tel: (949) 683-5411; Fax (949) 766-7603

E-Mail:

, orly.taitz@gmail.com

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Dr. ORLY TAITZ, ESQ, PRO SE

§ Case 11-cv-402

Plaintiff,

§ Hon Judge Lamberth

**§Chief Judge Presiding** 

v.

§

§

Michael Astrue, Commissioner of the

§

Social Security Administration,

S

§

§

§

Respondent

8

## MOTION TO STRIKE 11.04.2013 MOTION TO STRIKE BY THE DEFENSE

# MOTION TO STRIKE 11.04.2013 OPPOSITION BY THE DEFENSE TO 10.16.2013 MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

According to local rules LCVR 7 any responsive pleadings to a motion are supposed to be filed within 14 days.

(b) OPPOSING POINTS AND AUTHORITIES.
Within 14 days of the date of service or at such other time as the Court may direct, an opposing party shall serve and file a memorandum of points and authorities in opposition to the motion. If such a memorandum is not filed within the prescribed time, the Court may treat the motion as conceded

Motion for reconsideration was submitted on 10.11.2013, was approved by the court for filing on 10.15.2013 and docketed and received by the defense on 1016.2013. Responsive pleadings were due on 10.30. 2013. Defense yet again did not submit timely pleadings. Responsive pleadings were not submitted until 11.04.2013, 5 days late. While defense demands striking plaintiff's filings on any minor technical error, defense repeatedly does not comply with the rules of court.

Specifically, defense did not respond to prior Motion for Reconsideration, which was filed in June of 2013. Plaintiff filed a motion for default/failure to file responsive pleadings as a sign of consent to Motion for Reconsideration. Only after this motion by the plaintiff, defense filed a Motion for Leave of Court to file a late opposition.

This court ignored the fact that Defense did not file a timely opposition and ruled based on their belated opposition.

This time defense is emboldened and filed late responsive pleadings yet again without even bothering to ask for a leave of court to file late responsive pleadings.

If this court holds plaintiff to rules of court, it should hold the defense to the rules of court as well.

Further, defense is a US government with millions of dollars and unlimited resources taken from citizens in taxation. Defense has sufficient personal to file timely responses and check and double check he dates and the pleadings.

Plaintiff is a civil rights leader, who is working pro bono and who works full time as a Doctor of Dental Surgery to subsidize her civil rights works. If anything, more leeway should be given to the plaintiff and not to the defense.

11.04.2013 Motion to Strike should be stricken/or denied not only as a late filing, but also as moot, as it seeks to strike a pleading because defense found two redaction deficiencies in a 37 page motion and exhibits. Sworn declaration of assistant Emilia Dubert, which is attached as Exhibit 1 to the reply and to this Motion to Strike, states that she made an error, it was corrected and corrected document #52 was submitted to court for docketing, which makes the motion to strike moot.

The case at hand seeks a release of a SS-5 application to SSN of one Harry Bounel, born in 1890, which was fraudulently taken/stolen by Barack Obama, it exposes a De Facto RICO, whereby a high ranking official of the US Government, SSA, Dawn Wiggins, defrauded this court in order to hide this identity theft and theft of the U.S. Presidency with stolen and fabricated IDs.

This case warrants expedient processing and late filings by the defense should be stricken

Taite

Respectfully,

/s/ Dr. Orly Taitz, ESQ

11.08.2013

### **EXHIBIT 1**

#### **DECLARATION OF EMILIA DUBERT**

My name is Emilia Dubert, I am an assistant to Dr. Orly Taitz. I am over 18 years old and I have personal knowledge of the facts described below.

I usually do redaction of documents that Dr. Taitz sends to court.

Dr. Taitz asked me to redact the first five digits in all Social Security numbers in the motion for Reconsideration in Taitz v Astrue 11-cv-402, which was sent to the USDC on 10.11.2013. I reviewed all 37 pages and did the redactions.

Defense is mistaken in regards to page 29. Both Social Security numbers for Michelle and Barack Obama were properly redacted. The numbers on the bottom of the page are not the Social Security numbers, but the phone number and license information of the accountant for Mr. and Mrs. Obama. Just to be on the safe side I redacted those on 11.07.2013.

In regards to page 25 and 32, both pages had very small font and were foggy and I missed these two small spots. I redacted those two small areas on 11.07.2013 upon receipt of the notice of omission in the response by Assistant U.S. Attorney Mr. Soskin and I placed a new printout with these 2 redacted areas to be mailed to court. Dr. Taitz called the court on the same day and left the message for the clerk to seal document #52 until the document with these two additional redactions is received.

l attest that all of the above is true and correct.
Emilia Dubert
11.08.2013
·
State of California
County of ORANGE
Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this 2TH day of NOVENBER.
20 13 by EMILIA DUBERT
proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(**) who appeared before me.
MATT STOEVE
Signature (Notary scal) (7) COMM1958310 (7) COMM
ORANGE COUNTY W

#### PROPOSED ORDER

Dr. ORLY TAITZ, ESQ, PRO SE

Plaintiff,

S Hon Judge Lamberth

SChief Judge Presiding

v.

S

Michael Astrue, Commissioner of the

S Case 11-cv-402

S Hon Judge Presiding

S Chief Judge Presiding

S S

Certificate of Service

Social Security Administration,

I, Lila Dubert, certify that defendants were served with attached Motion to Strike and Reply to Opposition in the above captioned case on 11.08.2013 by First Class mail at

§

US Attorneys' office

555 Fourth Str. NW

Washington DC 20530

Lila Dubert

11.08.2013