

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Grinols et al
Plaintiff
v.
Electoral College, U.S. Congress et al
Defendant
Civil Action No. 12-cv-02997
(If the action is pending in another district, state where:)

SUBPOENA TO PRODUCE DOCUMENTS, INFORMATION, OR OBJECTS OR TO PERMIT INSPECTION OF PREMISES IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: Congressman Mike Conaway, member of the Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities

Production: YOU ARE COMMANDED to produce at the time, date, and place set forth below the following documents, electronically stored information, or objects, and permit their inspection, copying, testing, or sampling of the material: fully filed out "Urgent Demand for Verification" attached herein

Place: Law Offices of Orly Taitz
29839 Santa Margarita, ste 100
Rancho Santa Margarita CA 92688
Date and Time: 03/19/2013 9:00 am

Inspection of Premises: YOU ARE COMMANDED to permit entry onto the designated premises, land, or other property possessed or controlled by you at the time, date, and location set forth below, so that the requesting party may inspect, measure, survey, photograph, test, or sample the property or any designated object or operation on it.

Place:
Date and Time:

The provisions of Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(c), relating to your protection as a person subject to a subpoena, and Rule 45 (d) and (e), relating to your duty to respond to this subpoena and the potential consequences of not doing so, are attached.

Date: 03/04/2013

CLERK OF COURT

OR

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Taitz

Attorney's signature

The name, address, e-mail, and telephone number of the attorney representing (name of party) Plaintiffs Grinols et al, who issues or requests this subpoena, are:

Orly Taitz ESQ
29839 Santa Margarita, ste 100
Rancho Santa Margarita CA 92688 Orly.Taitz@gmail.com 949-683-5411

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45 (c), (d), and (e) (Effective 12/1/07)

(c) Protecting a Person Subject to a Subpoena.

(1) Avoiding Undue Burden or Expense; Sanctions. A party or attorney responsible for issuing and serving a subpoena must take reasonable steps to avoid imposing undue burden or expense on a person subject to the subpoena. The issuing court must enforce this duty and impose an appropriate sanction — which may include lost earnings and reasonable attorney’s fees — on a party or attorney who fails to comply.

(2) Command to Produce Materials or Permit Inspection.

(A) Appearance Not Required. A person commanded to produce documents, electronically stored information, or tangible things, or to permit the inspection of premises, need not appear in person at the place of production or inspection unless also commanded to appear for a deposition, hearing, or trial.

(B) Objections. A person commanded to produce documents or tangible things or to permit inspection may serve on the party or attorney designated in the subpoena a written objection to inspecting, copying, testing or sampling any or all of the materials or to inspecting the premises — or to producing electronically stored information in the form or forms requested. The objection must be served before the earlier of the time specified for compliance or 14 days after the subpoena is served. If an objection is made, the following rules apply:

(i) At any time, on notice to the commanded person, the serving party may move the issuing court for an order compelling production or inspection.

(ii) These acts may be required only as directed in the order, and the order must protect a person who is neither a party nor a party’s officer from significant expense resulting from compliance.

(3) Quashing or Modifying a Subpoena.

(A) When Required. On timely motion, the issuing court must quash or modify a subpoena that:

(i) fails to allow a reasonable time to comply;

(ii) requires a person who is neither a party nor a party’s officer to travel more than 100 miles from where that person resides, is employed, or regularly transacts business in person — except that, subject to Rule 45(c)(3)(B)(iii), the person may be commanded to attend a trial by traveling from any such place within the state where the trial is held;

(iii) requires disclosure of privileged or other protected matter, if no exception or waiver applies; or

(iv) subjects a person to undue burden.

(B) When Permitted. To protect a person subject to or affected by a subpoena, the issuing court may, on motion, quash or modify the subpoena if it requires:

(i) disclosing a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information;

(ii) disclosing an unretained expert’s opinion or information that does not describe specific occurrences in dispute and results from the expert’s study that was not requested by a party; or

(iii) a person who is neither a party nor a party’s officer to incur substantial expense to travel more than 100 miles to attend trial.

(C) Specifying Conditions as an Alternative. In the circumstances described in Rule 45(c)(3)(B), the court may, instead of quashing or modifying a subpoena, order appearance or production under specified conditions if the serving party:

(i) shows a substantial need for the testimony or material that cannot be otherwise met without undue hardship; and

(ii) ensures that the subpoenaed person will be reasonably compensated.

(d) Duties in Responding to a Subpoena.

(1) Producing Documents or Electronically Stored Information.

These procedures apply to producing documents or electronically stored information:

(A) Documents. A person responding to a subpoena to produce documents must produce them as they are kept in the ordinary course of business or must organize and label them to correspond to the categories in the demand.

(B) Form for Producing Electronically Stored Information Not Specified. If a subpoena does not specify a form for producing electronically stored information, the person responding must produce it in a form or forms in which it is ordinarily maintained or in a reasonably usable form or forms.

(C) Electronically Stored Information Produced in Only One Form. The person responding need not produce the same electronically stored information in more than one form.

(D) Inaccessible Electronically Stored Information. The person responding need not provide discovery of electronically stored information from sources that the person identifies as not reasonably accessible because of undue burden or cost. On motion to compel discovery or for a protective order, the person responding must show that the information is not reasonably accessible because of undue burden or cost. If that showing is made, the court may nonetheless order discovery from such sources if the requesting party shows good cause, considering the limitations of Rule 26(b)(2)(C). The court may specify conditions for the discovery.

(2) Claiming Privilege or Protection.

(A) Information Withheld. A person withholding subpoenaed information under a claim that it is privileged or subject to protection as trial-preparation material must:

(i) expressly make the claim; and

(ii) describe the nature of the withheld documents, communications, or tangible things in a manner that, without revealing information itself privileged or protected, will enable the parties to assess the claim.

(B) Information Produced. If information produced in response to a subpoena is subject to a claim of privilege or of protection as trial-preparation material, the person making the claim may notify any party that received the information of the claim and the basis for it. After being notified, a party must promptly return, sequester, or destroy the specified information and any copies it has; must not use or disclose the information until the claim is resolved; must take reasonable steps to retrieve the information if the party disclosed it before being notified; and may promptly present the information to the court under seal for a determination of the claim. The person who produced the information must preserve the information until the claim is resolved.

(e) Contempt. The issuing court may hold in contempt a person who, having been served, fails without adequate excuse to obey the subpoena. A nonparty’s failure to obey must be excused if the subpoena purports to require the nonparty to attend or produce at a place outside the limits of Rule 45(c)(3)(A)(ii).

Civil Action No. 12-cv-02997

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 45.)

This subpoena for *name of individual and title, if any* CONGRESSMAN MIKE CONAWAY
was received by me on *date* 3/11/2013.

I served the subpoena by delivering a copy to the named person as follows: DIRECTLY TO
MIKE CONAWAY AT TOWN HALL MEETING
MIDLAND, TX on *date* 3/11/2013 or

I returned the subpoena unexecuted because:

Unless the subpoena was issued on behalf of the United States, or one of its officers or agents, I have also
tendered to the witness fees for one day's attendance, and the mileage allowed by law, in the amount of
\$

My fees are \$ for travel and \$ for services, for a total of \$ 0.00

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: 3/11/2013


Server's signature
PAUL J. MARKO
Printed name and title

1601 SEABOARD, MIDLAND, TX 79705
Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

URGENT DEMAND FOR VERIFICATION

On 12.12.2012 a legal action *Grinols, Odden, Judd, Noonan and MacLaren v Electoral College, President of the Senate, Congress, Barack Hussein Obama, aka Barack (Barry) Soetoro, aka Barack Barry Soebarkah, Governor of California and Secretary of State of California* was filed by several Presidential electors and minor presidential candidates. The case number is 12-cv-02997 Presiding Judge Morrison C. England Eastern District of California. U.S. Attorney Benjamin Wagner and Deputy U.S. Attorney Edward Olsen made an appearance as attorneys representing U.S. Congress, President of the Senate, Electoral College and Barack Obama. A motion for a TRO (temporary restraining order) was filed by the plaintiffs to enjoin the certification of the electoral votes for Obama and enjoin taking of the oath of office by Obama pending adjudication on the merits of his legitimacy for the U.S. Presidency in light of the fact that he is using a Connecticut Social Security number 042-68-4425, which was never signed to him according to E-Verify and SSNVS, due to the fact that in his mother's passport he is listed under a different last name, Soebarkah, due to the fact that multiple experts and members of law enforcement found his Selective Service application and long form and short form birth certificates to be computer generated forgeries and a number of other reasons. U.S. attorneys Wagner and Olsen filed an opposition to the TRO. Their opposition means that each and every US congressman, U.S. Senator, each and every Elector; all 435 US representatives, all 100 Senators, all 538 Presidential Electors oppose adjudication on the merits of above issues and do not want to get answers to the questions essential to the U.S. National security prior to the inauguration. It came to the attention of the plaintiffs that a number of Defendants actually shared the concerns of the plaintiffs and did not know that the US attorneys represented them and opposed the motion for TRO. You are requested to fill out the questioner below and clarify whether you were aware of the facts and evidence provided with the complaint and that you authorized Wagner and Olsen to oppose the TRO.

Questions	Initial yes	Initial no
<p>1. I was notified that U.S. Attorney Benjamin Wagner and Deputy Attorney General Edward Olsen(hereinafter Wagner and Olsen) are representing me in <i>Grinols et al v Electoral College et al 12-cv-02997</i> Eastern District of California, presiding Chief Judge Morrison C. England</p> <p>(Attorney for Plaintiffs Orly Taitz, 29839 Santa Margarita, ste 100, Rancho Santa Margarita, Ca 92688 phone 949-683-5411, fax 949-766-7603 orly.taitz@gmail.com)</p>		
<p>2. I authorized Wagner and Olsen to file an opposition to TRO, opposing a stay of certification and a stay of taking the oath of office by Obama pending adjudication on the merits of the evidence of forgery in the Selective Service Certificate, long form birth certificate and short form birth certificate of Barack Hussein Obama, aka Barack (Barry) Soetoro aka Barack (Barry) obama Soebarkah and evidence of fraudulent use by him of Connecticut Social Security number 042-68-4425 by Barack Hussein Obama</p>		

<p>3. Wagner and Olsen forwarded to me a sworn affidavit of the retired Chief Investigator of the Special Investigations Unit of the U.S. Coast Guard and former special agent for the Department of Homeland Security Jeffrey Stephan Coffman, where Coffman states under the penalty of perjury that the alleged application for Selective Service by Barack Obama is an altered document</p>		
<p>4. I was given by Wagner and Olsen the TRO motion, where it is explained that a male who did not register with the Selective Service and who does not have a valid registration for the Selective Service (not an altered or forged one, but a valid one) is disqualified from holding any position within the Executive branch of the United States government pursuant to 5 USC § 3328.</p>		
<p>5. I am aware that as part of their complaint plaintiffs provided 2009 tax returns for Barack Obama, which show him using a Connecticut Social Security number 042-68-4425, even though Obama was never a resident of Connecticut and according to E-verify and SSNVS this number was never assigned to Obama</p>		
<p>6. I have read sworn affidavits of Sheriff of Maricopa County Joseph Arpaio, Investigator Mike Zullo, Retired Senior Deportation officer John Sampson, licensed Investigator Susan Daniels attesting to evidence of forgery in Obama's birth certificate, Selective Service Certificate and Social Security card</p>		
<p>7. I viewed the video tape of the press conference by Maricopa County, AZ Sheriff Arpaio and Investigator Zullo, as well as sworn witness testimony of witnesses Susan Daniels, Linda Jordan, Douglas Vogt, Felicito Papa attesting to evidence of fraud and forgery in Obama's IDs</p>		
<p>8. I read the passport records of deceased Stanley Ann Dunham, the mother of Barack Obama, obtained under Freedom of Information Act, included with the complaint, showing Obama listed under the last name Soebarkah in his mother's passport records. I understand that one has to be sworn in under a correct legal name.</p>		
<p>9. I read the sworn affidavit of the assistant clerk of the office of the Registrar of Hawaii Timothy Adams stating that it was a common knowledge in the office of the Registrar of Hawaii that there is no birth certificate for Obama in any hospital in Hawaii</p>		
<p>10. I reviewed the biography of Barack Obama submitted by Barack Obama to his publisher Acton-Dystel in 1991 and kept on the official web site of Acton Dystel, where Obama stated that he was born in Kenya and raised in Indonesia. I understand that this biography was removed from the official web site of the publisher in 2007 when Obama decided to run for the U.S. President and needed to be a "natural born" U.S. Citizen</p>		

11. I understand that Obama's alleged selective service certificate contains a two digit year stamp "80", while for over a hundred years all U.S. stamps have a four digit year, such as ""1980"		
12. I understand that Obama's alleged copy of his long form birth certificate contains letters of different shapes and different sizes, which is impossible when the documents is created with a type writer.		
13. I understand that not one single judge or jury or forensic document expert was allowed to see the original birth certificate for Obama, the original application for the Selective Service and the original application for the Connecticut Social Security number used by Barack Obama		
14. I understand that in his School registration in Indonesia in 1967 Barack Obama is listed as a citizen of Indonesia. I understand that there is no record of him changing his citizenship after returning to the U.S. from Indonesia and relinquishing his Indonesian citizenship. I understand that even if Obama/Soetoro/Soebarkah were to change his citizenship upon his return from Indonesia, he would be naturalized and not natural born citizen as required for the position of the U.S. President according to article 2, section 1 of the U.S. Constitution		
15. I understand that in his school registration in Indonesia Barack Obama is listed under the last name of his step father Soetoro. I understand that there is no record of Obama ever changing his name from Soetoro to Obama		
16. With full knowledge of above facts I authorized Wagner and Olsen to file an opposition to TRO, opposing a temporary stay of certification and a stay of taking the oath of office of the U.S. President by Barack Hussein Obama, aka Barack(Barry) Soetoro, aka Barack (Barry) Obama Soebarkah pending adjudication on the merits of the evidence of forgery in his Selective Service Certificate, his long form birth certificate and short form birth certificate, evidence of fraudulent use of Connecticut Social Security number 042-68-4425 by Barack Hussein Obama and other related issues		

Signed:

US Representative/state

US Senator/state

Presidential elector/state

President of the Senate Joseph Biden

Dated

Please, forward the signed form to the Attorney for the Plaintiffs

Orly Taitz 29839 Santa Margarita, ste 100, Rancho Santa Margarita, Ca 92688 phone 949-683-5411, fax 949-766-7603 orly.taitz@gmail.com at your earliest convenience. Due to the great importance to the National security answers are requested to be sent immediately by fax or e-mail and followed up by sending a certified copy by mail