

national security and deals with high ranking state officials aiding and abetting elections fraud and forgery committed by candidate for the US Presidency Barack Hussein Obama.

ARGUMENT

1. On June 12, 2012 Honorable Judge S. K. Reid issued an order "Court orders case dismissal for failing to follow requests " Exhibit 1 Civil Case Results, Entry Detail 06.12.2012
2. Exhibit 2, Case Activity Report from 06.20. 2012 shows that there were never any Requests made by the court.
3. Exhibit 3 Affidavit by attorney Orly Taitz, Plaintiff Pro Se in the above captioned case attesting to the fact that she never received any requests from the court, there are no requests by the court on the docket, and there was never any failure to follow requests, as there were never any requests. Rule 60 (B) (1) provides for relief from Judgment/order due to mistake.

Rule 60. Relief from judgment or order

(A) Clerical mistakes. Of its own initiative or on the motion of any party and after such notice, if any, as the court orders, clerical mistakes in judgments, orders or other parts of the record and errors therein arising from oversight or omission may be corrected by the trial court at any time before the Notice of Completion of Clerk's Record is filed under Appellate Rule 8. After filing of the Notice of Completion of Clerk's Record and during an appeal, such mistakes may be so corrected with leave of the court on appeal.

(B) Mistake--Excusable neglect--Newly discovered evidence--Fraud, etc. On motion and upon such terms as are just the court may relieve a party or his legal representative from a judgment, including a judgment by default, for the following reasons:

- (1) mistake, surprise, or excusable neglect;
- (2) any ground for a motion to correct error, including without limitation newly discovered evidence, which by due diligence could not have been discovered in time to move for a motion to correct errors under Rule 59;
- (3) fraud (whether heretofore denominated intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation, or other misconduct of an adverse party;
- (4) entry of default or judgment by default was entered against such party who was served only by publication and who was without actual knowledge of the action and judgment, order or proceedings;
- (5) except in the case of a divorce decree, the record fails to show that such party was represented by a guardian or other representative, and if the motion asserts and such party proves that
 - (a) at the time of the action he was an infant or incompetent person, and
 - (b) he was not in fact represented by a guardian or other representative, and
 - (c) the person against whom the judgment, order or proceeding is being avoided procured the judgment with notice of such infancy or incompetency, and, as against a successor of such person, that such successor acquired his rights therein with notice that the judgment was procured against an infant or incompetent, and
 - (d) no appeal or other remedies allowed under this subdivision have been taken or made by or on behalf of the infant or incompetent person, and
 - (e) the motion was made within ninety [90] days after the disability was removed or a guardian was appointed over his estate, and
 - (f) the motion alleges a valid defense or claim;
- (6) the judgment is void;
- (7) the judgment has been satisfied, released, or discharged, or a prior judgment upon which it is based has been reversed or otherwise vacated, or it is no longer equitable that the judgment should have prospective application; or
- (8) any reason justifying relief from the operation of the judgment, other than those reasons set forth in sub-paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4).

The motion shall be filed within a reasonable time for reasons (5), (6), (7), and (8), and not more than one year after the judgment, order or proceeding was entered or taken for reasons (1), (2), (3), and (4). A movant filing a motion for reasons (1), (2), (3), (4), and (8) must allege a meritorious claim or defense. A motion under this subdivision (B) does not affect the finality of a judgment or suspend its operation. This rule does not limit the power of a court to entertain an independent action to relieve a party from a judgment, order or proceeding or for fraud upon the court. Writs of coram nobis, coram vobis, audita querela, and bills of review and bills in the nature of a bill of review, are abolished, and the procedure for obtaining any relief from a judgment shall be by motion as prescribed in these rules or by an independent action.

(C) Appeal--Change of venue. A ruling or order of the court denying or granting relief, in whole or in part, by motion under subdivision (B) of this rule shall be deemed a final judgment, and an appeal may be taken therefrom as in the case of a judgment. No change of venue in such cases shall be taken from the judge or county except for cause shown by affidavit.

(D) Hearing and relief granted. In passing upon a motion allowed by subdivision (B) of this rule the court shall hear any pertinent evidence, allow new parties to be served with summons, allow

discovery, grant relief as provided under Rule 59 or otherwise as permitted by subdivision (B) of this rule.

(E) Infants, incompetents, and governmental organizations. Except as otherwise provided herein, this rule shall apply to infants, incompetents, and governmental organizations. The time for seeking relief against a judgment, order or proceeding allowed or recognized under subdivision (B) of this rule or any other statute shall not be tolled or extended as to such persons.

Due to the fact that a clear error of fact was committed by the court, and there were never any requests from the court and there was never any failure to follow any requests as there were never any requests, the court should reverse an erroneous order of dismissal and reinstate the case. The reinstatement of the case should be done immediately as this is the case of national importance and paramount to national security. Defendants in this case, Secretary of State of Indiana Connie Lawson and members of Elections Commission breached their fiduciary duty to the petitioners, acted negligently and with malice and committed fraud by allowing Barack Hussein Obama, a foreign national, who is using a name that is not legally his, using a forged birth certificate, forged Selective Service certificate and fraudulently obtained Social Security number, which was not assigned to him according to E-Verify and SSNVS, to be a candidate on the ballot in the State of Indiana. The actions by the defendants are so egregious that they border on treason. If this court does not correct a clear error of fact and does

not reinstate this case immediately, this court will become complicit in the crimes committed by the defendants and will become complicit to treason by allowing a foreign national with forged identification papers on the ballot in the state of Indiana.

CONCLUSION

Due to flagrant error of fact above captioned case should be reinstated immediately.

Respectfully submitted



/s/ Dr. Orly Taitz, ESQ

Dated

06.24.2012

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Yulia Yun, am not a party to the above captioned case, I attest that I served the defendants in this case with above pleadings by first class mail through their attorney at the following address:

Deputy Attorney General

Jefferson Garn

302 W. Washington Str.

5th floor

Indianapolis, IN 46204

Signed _____

Yulia Yun

Dated _____

cc Congressman Darell Issa
Chairman
House oversight committee
2347 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington DC, 20515

cc Congressman Lamar Smith
Chairman of the House Committee
On the Judiciary
2409 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington DC, 20515

Public Integrity Section
Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington DC 20530-0001

Inspector General
U.S. Department of Justice
Investigations Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Room 4706
Washington, DC 20530

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)

Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights Defenders

The Honorable Mrs. Margaret Sekaggya

Palais des Nations

CH-1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland

International Criminal bar Hague

United Nations Commission for

Civil Rights Defenders

Orsolya Toth (Ms)

Human Rights Officer

Civil and Political Rights Section

Special Procedures Division

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights

Inter -American Commission on Human Rights
1889 F Street, N.W.. Washington, D.C., 20006 U.S.A..
Tel.: 202-458-6002, 202-458-6002. Fax: 202-458-3992.

Luis Del Castillo

President International Criminal Panel

luisdelcastillo@bpi-icb.com

Barreau Pénal International Criminal Bar

Barcelona Secretariat:

Avenida Diagonal 529, 1^o2^a 08025 Barcelona, España

EXHIBIT 1

ORDER TO DISMISS FOR FAILING TO FOLLOW REQUESTS



Civil Case Summary Results

Thu Jun 21 19:51:57 EDT 2012

Entry Detail

Case:	ORLY TAITZ DR VS.ELECTIONS COMMISSION
Cause Number:	49D141203MI012046
Suffix:	
Case Status:	O
Event Date:	06/12/12
Last Updated By:	OCW9016
Judge:	S.K. REID, JUDGE
Event Type:	99999

**Event
Description:**

JACKET ENTRY: PETITIONER'S(ALL) IN PERSON PRO SE;
RESPONDENT COMMISSION BY COUNSEL; COURT CONDUCTS
HEARING ON PENDING MOTIONS; ORAL ARGUMENT
HEARD;COURT ORDERS CASE DISMISSAL FOR FAILING TO
FOLLOW REQUESTS

****End of Record(s)****

[Return to Case Summary](#)

If you want to perform a new name search, click [HERE](#).

[Return](#)

EXHIBIT 2
DOCKET OF
TAITZ V ELECTIONS COMMISSION SHOWING NO REQUESTS EVER
MADE

EXHIBIT 3

DECLARATION OF ORLY TAITZ

I, Orly Taitz, am a licensed attorney in the state of California and admitted to all courts in the state of California, 9th circuit Court of Appeals, 3rd Circuit Court of Appeals, Supreme Court of the United States, International Criminal Bar Panel in Hague and pro hac vice in multiple courts around the country. I am licensed for 10 years.

I attest under the penalty of perjury

1. I never received any requests from the court
2. After the order of dismissal was entered, I checked the chronological docket and there are no requests from the court on the docket either.
3. I never failed to follow any requests as there were never any requests from the court. My co-plaintiffs did not fail to follow any requests, as the docket shows no requests from the court whatsoever, either to me or any other plaintiffs.
4. In my professional opinion as a licensed attorney, who is not licensed in Indiana, but licensed in multiple other courts, order of dismissal

represents a clear error of fact, which is exacerbated by the fact that this is a matter of national importance dealing with the most egregious fraud, forgery and possibly reason committed by defendants by allowing a foreign national Barack Hussein Obama to be on the ballot in the State of Indiana in clear code violation by using a last name, which is not legally his and all forged identification papers.

5. In my professional opinion of a licensed attorney with 10 years of experience and admitted in multiple courts (not in Indiana) including multiple Courts of Appeals and Supreme Court of the United States, the order to dismiss needs to be reversed immediately due to flagrant error and due to national importance.

I attest to above under the penalty of perjury. Declarant further says naught.



/s/ Dr. Orly Taitz, ESQ

06.24.2012