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**Response by Plaintiff Dr. Orly Taitz, ESQ to Defendants' 06.14.2012 notice of supplemental authority**

On 06. 14.2012 Defendant Democratic Party of Mississippi filed a notice of supplemental authority.

Plaintiff responds as follows:

1. Decision in Taitz v Astrue 11-5304 is not final. Court of Appeals clearly stated that Mandate will not be issued and the Petitioner can file a Petition for En Banc hearing. On May 31, 2012 petitioner Dr. Orly Taitz, ESQ, hereinafter 'Taitz", under local rule 35 submitted a Petition for hearing En Banc. This petition was filed by the court on June 4, 2012.

What was the point in defendant's notice of supplemental authority, filed 10 days after Petition for En Banc hearing was filed, when defendant clearly knew that this is not a final decision, mandate was not issued, and Taitz was advised by the court that she can file for en banc rehearing, which she did? The only reasonable explanation is the same modus operandi, where defendants are trying to mislead the court. (Exhibit 1)

2. Aside from Petition for En banc Hearing Taitz submitted to the DC court of Appeals an affidavit by Sheriff Joseph M. Arpaio of Maricopa county Arizona (Exhibit 2), where Arpaio is attesting to forgery in Obama's identification papers, including his birth certificate and Social Security number, which should lead to a decision by the Court o of Appeals to allow release of the original SS-5 for the Connecticut Social Security number, which was never assigned to him. It is inconceivable to believe the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit would engage in aiding and abetting elections fraud, forgery and treason by allowing a foreign national to usurp the U.S. Presidency by virtue of use of forged and fraudulently obtained Social Security number and other forged identification records.

3. Honorable Magistrate Anderson has stayed all discovery pending decision on Motion to Remand the case to the state court. Continuous filings by the defendants unduly burden the court with unnecessary pleadings, instead of giving the court an opportunity to address the most basic initial motion to remand the case back to the state court due to complete lack of jurisdiction to proceed in the Federal court.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Dr. Oly Taitz, ESQ 06.18.2012