

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUITCERTIFICATE OF SERVICECase Number 26-1526Short Case Caption McDermott v. US

**NOTE:** Proof of service is only required when the rules specify that service must be accomplished outside the court's electronic filing system. See Fed. R. App. P. 25(d); Fed. Cir. R. 25(e). Attach additional pages as needed.

I certify that I served a copy of the foregoing filing on 05/27/2026by ☒ U.S. Mail ☐ Hand Delivery ☐ Email ☐ Facsimile  
☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

on the below individuals at the following locations.

| Person Served    | Service Location (Address, Facsimile, Email) |
|------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| George McDermott | 143 N. Huron Dr., Forest Heights, MD 20745   |
|                  |                                              |
|                  |                                              |
|                  |                                              |
|                  |                                              |

☐ Additional pages attached.Date: 05/27/2026Signature: /s/ Daniel D. FalknorName: Daniel D. Falknor

9

Att-1

court notes that although plaintiff requests "that this court restore captions of all filings properly to the court's docket to preserve the record for appeal to the US Supreme Court," the court did not file plaintiff's submissions on the docket prior to the February 6, 2026 submission because plaintiff's submissions have not been in conformance with the Rules of the United States Court of Federal Claims.

The court determines that this court lacks jurisdiction over the allegations included in plaintiff's current complaint before the court. Plaintiff may appeal this decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, and then to the United States Supreme Court, as is his right.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Marian Blank Horn  
**MARIAN BLANK HORN**  
Judge

Defendant's motion to dismiss notes "the only statute referenced in the complaint is the All Writs Act." Plaintiff alleges:

NOTICE IS REQUIRED UNDER THE ALL-WRITS ACT, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(A) MANDAMUS TO COMPEL INFERIOR COURT OFFICERS AND AGENTS AS WELL AS DEFENDANT OFFICERS AND AGENTS DIVULGE THEIR JURISDICTION AND AUTHORITY TO ENGAGE IN THE ONGOING MALICIOUS CRIMINAL /CIVIL VIOLATIONS OF THEIR OUT OF OFFICE, THE JUDICIAL BONDS, AND THEIR OVERT ACTS OF JUDICIAL CORPORATE FALSIFICATION OF COURT RECORDS, MALICIOUS ACTS OF DESTROYING COURT DOCUMENTS, AND MOUTH FOR THESE ACTS OF ISSUING KNOWINGLY FRAUDULENT UNSIGNED ORDERS WHICH FOR THE PAST 32 YEARS NO COURT HAS RESPONDED TO NUMEROUS CERTIFICATIONS OF A QUESTION OF LAW AS TO THEIR LEGAL JURISDICTION, CAPACITY, AND AUTHORIT

The All Writs Act "permits writs in aid of jurisdiction, but does not itself create jurisdiction." Tasby v. United States, 87 Fed. Cl. 180, 181 (2009) (citing Stephenson v. Dow Chem. Co., 346 F.3d 19, 21 (2nd Cir. 2003)). As noted by another Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims:

While our court, as one "established by Act of Congress," may issue writs of mandamus under the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a), see Cox v. West, 149 F.3d 1360, 1363 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (holding that Article I courts may issue writs under the act), these are limited to writs "necessary or appropriate in aid of" a court's jurisdiction. 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a).

Holmes v. United States, 142 Fed. Cl. 791, 792 (2019). As this court lacks jurisdiction over plaintiff's claims, the All Writs Act, by itself, cannot create jurisdiction for plaintiff's claims in this court. Defendant's motion to dismiss is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff's complaint is **DISMISSED**. The Clerk of the Court shall enter **JUDGMENT** consistent with this Order.

Regarding plaintiff's February 6, 2026 submission titled: "NOW George Mc Dermott THROUGH THESE MOTION PRACTICE OF THIS COURT IN RESPONSE TO A SECRETIVE TEXT MESSAGE RECEIVED 02/05/2026 AND NOT BY EMAIL WHICH INCLUDED A COPY OF COURT DOCKET SHEETS REFLECTED IN ALLEGED ORDER OF 02/04/2026 [ECF 17], WHICH MUST BE CHALLENGED APPELLANT IS PUTTING THE COURT ON NOTICE OF MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THIS ALLEGED ORDER WILL BE FILED SEEKING REVIEW BY THE FULL COURT EXCLUDED SENIOR JUDGE MARIAN BLANK HORN. THIS COURT'S RULES (1), THE RULES OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERALCLAIMS ARE DRAWN UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF 28 U.S.C. §§ 2071(A), (C); 2503(8) (GENERALLY); 2521(A) AND RULES (5)(D) (4)," (capitalization, brackets, and emphasis in original), the

does not have subject matter jurisdiction over actions arising under the Civil Rights Acts. See Pikulin v. United States, 97 Fed. Cl. 71, 77 ("Plaintiff also cites various provisions of the Civil Rights Acts, including § 1981, § 1983, § 1985, and § 1986, as bases for his claim. The court does not possess jurisdiction to entertain claims based on these statutes." (citing Marlin v. United States, 63 Fed. Cl. 475, 476, appeal dismissed, 140 F. App'x 256 (Fed. Cir. 2005), and Anderson v. United States, 22 Cl. Ct. 178, 179 n. 2 (1990), aff'd, 937 F.2d 623 (Fed. Cir. 1991)), appeal dismissed, 425 F. App'x 902 (Fed. Cir. 2011)); Hubbard v. United States, 80 Fed. Cl. 282, 283 (noting that the Civil Rights Act encompasses 42 U.S.C. § 1988), aff'd, 315 F. App'x 307 (Fed. Cir. 2009); Schweitzer v. United States, 82 Fed. Cl. 592, 595 (2008) ("Likewise, this court does not have jurisdiction over the plaintiffs' civil rights claims brought under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985 or 1986 (2000), because it is well-settled that jurisdiction over such claims lies exclusively in the district courts." (citing Stamps v. United States, 73 Fed. Cl. 603, 609-10 (2006) (citing Anderson v. United States, 22 Cl. Ct. at 179))).

To the extent plaintiff is alleging tortious actions, the Tucker Act specifically excludes tort claims from the jurisdiction of the United States Court of Federal Claims. See 28 U.S.C. §1491(a) ("The United States Court of Federal Claims shall have jurisdiction to render judgment upon any claim against the United States founded either upon the Constitution, or any Act of Congress or any regulation of an executive department, or upon any express or implied contract with the United States, or for liquidated or unliquidated damages in cases not sounding in tort.") (emphasis added); see also Keene Corp. v. United States, 508 U.S. 200, 214 (1993); Allen v. United States, 88 F.4th 983, 986 (Fed. Cir. 2023); Rick's Mushroom Serv. Inc., v. United States, 521 F.3d 1338, 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2008); Alves v. United States, 133 F.3d 1454, 1459 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Also, to the extent plaintiff's allegations involve allegations of criminal activity, the United States Court of Federal Claims lacks subject matter jurisdiction to adjudicate such claims. See Joshua v. United States, 17 F.3d 378, 379 (Fed. Cir. 1994); see also Ali-Bey v. United States, 169 Fed. Cl. 729, 737 (2024) ("this Court lacks jurisdiction over criminal causes of action"); Okoro v. United States, 169 Fed. Cl. 462, 465 (2024) (citing Joshua v. United States, 17 F.3d at 379); Morisset v. United States, 169 Fed. Cl. 307, 309 (2024).

---

Plaintiffs also make multiple statements in their complaint that refer to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and Maryland state courts as "lower" courts. Compl., passim. The court construes these statements to suggest that plaintiffs seek to challenge the decisions of those courts here. The court, however, cannot do so. Colbert v. United States, 617 Fed. Appx. 981, 983 (Fed. Cir. 2015) ("The [U.S. Court of Federal Claims] may not substantively review the wisdom of earlier district court orders."). Nor could the U.S. Court of Federal Claims intervene in any proceeding before those courts as requested by plaintiffs.

McDermott v. United States, 130 Fed. Cl. at 413-14 (alteration in original). The cover sheet included with plaintiff's complaint in the above captioned case does not appear to relate to the above captioned case or the 2017 case filed in this court.

and cannot entertain a taking[s] claim that requires the court to scrutinize the actions of another tribunal." (internal quotation marks omitted; alterations in original)), reh'g en banc denied, (Fed. Cir. 2011), cert. denied, 565 U.S. 1147 (2012); Vereda Ltda. v. United States, 271 F.3d 1367, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2001) ("[T]he Court of Federal Claims cannot entertain a taking claim that requires the court to scrutinize the actions of another tribunal." (alteration added, internal quotation marks omitted)); Allustiarte v. United States, 256 F.3d 1349, 1352 (Fed. Cir.) ("[T]he Court of Federal Claims does not have jurisdiction to review the decisions of district courts." (alterations added) (quoting Joshua v. United States, 17 F.3d at 380 (alteration added))), cert. denied, 534 U.S. 1042 (2001); see also Stewart v. United States, 166 Fed. Cl. 723, 726 (2023), ("this Court lacks authority to review allegations of misconduct by other courts"), appeal dismissed, No. 2024-1304, 2024 WL 1549741 (Fed. Cir. Apr. 10, 2024); Ottinger v. United States, 164 Fed. Cl. 379, 388 (2023) (quoting Allustiarte v. United States, 256 F.3d 1349, 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2001)) ("The Court of Federal Claims lacks jurisdiction to review the decisions of federal district courts and courts of appeals, and thus cannot entertain claims that 'require[] the court to 'scrutinize the actions' of another tribunal."); Yates v. United States, 150 Fed. Cl. 128, 137 (2020) ("[F]raud on another court does not allow this court to review the other court's judgment." (alterations added)); Carter v. United States, 142 Fed. Cl. 159, 162 (2019); Potter v. United States, 121 Fed. Cl. 168, 169 (2015). Therefore, because plaintiff's claims would require this court to review decisions by other federal courts, this court does not have jurisdiction over those claims alleged by plaintiff in his complaint. To the extent plaintiff is challenging any State court decisions, "this Court does not have jurisdiction to review decisions rendered by state courts." Taylor v. United States, 130 Fed. Cl. 570, 572, aff'd, 686 F. App'x 896 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (citing Landers v. United States, 39 Fed. Cl. 297, 301 (1997)); see also Gordon v. United States, No. 2025-1016, 2025 WL 635446, at \*1 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 27, 2025) (citing United States v. Sherwood, 312 U.S. at 588) ("The trial court was clearly correct that it could not entertain Mr. Gordon's collateral attacks on the Texas state court proceedings or claims against other Texas agencies, because it only has jurisdiction over claims against the United States.").

Included with plaintiff's complaint is what appears to be a cover sheet from a previous suit before the United States Court of Federal Claims, in which plaintiff listed the Nature of Suit Code as "440 civil rights denied" for "conspiracy beginning 1995 theft of \$2 million by CT insiders" and "Defendants theft of titles to business and personal residence of the plaintiff/petitioner through judicial terrorism, obstruction of justice and falsification court records by defendants."<sup>5</sup> To the extent plaintiff makes a civil rights claim, this court

<sup>5</sup> It is unclear whether this cover sheet associates with a case actually filed at the United States Court of Federal Claims. Records at the court reflect that plaintiff has filed two cases at this court, the case currently under review and another in 2017. See McDermott, et al. v. United States, 130 Fed. Cl. 412 (sua sponte dismissal of plaintiffs' claims for lack of jurisdiction). The Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims in the 2017 case explained:

over the claim."); Kissi v. United States, 102 Fed. Cl. 31, 35 (2011) (finding no jurisdiction based on the plaintiff's failure to show an existing contract and failure to "adequately plead a contract claim under RCFC 9(k)"), aff'd per curiam, 493 F. App'x 57 (Fed. Cir. 2012). RCFC 9(k) requires a party, "[i]n pleading a claim founded on a contract," to "identify the substantive provisions of the contract . . . on which the party relies." A plaintiff that attaches a copy of the alleged contract to the complaint and "identifies] the provisions and terms of the contract that have been breached" satisfies its burden under RCFC 9(k) because doing so allows the court to "render a decision . . . know[ing] the relevant terms of the contract." Garreaux v. United States, 77 Fed. Cl. 726, 730 (2007), quoted in Gonzalez-McCaulley Inv. Grp., Inc. v. United States, 93 Fed. Cl. 710, 715 (2010).

Christy, Inc. v. United States, 141 Fed. Cl. 641, 661 (2019), aff'd, 971 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2020), cert. denied, 141 S. Ct. 1393 (2021) (omission and alterations in original); see also Bell v. United States, 145 Fed. Cl. 378, 388 (2019) ("It is well-established that to pursue a breach of contract action in this Court, plaintiffs must establish the existence of a contract with the government and plaintiffs must also identify the substantive provisions of the contract upon which they rely.") (citing D & N Bank v. United States, 331 F.3d 1374, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2003); aff'd, 20 F.4th 768 (Fed. Cir. 2021); Rohland v. United States, 136 Fed. Cl. 55, 67 (2018). As also stated by a Judge of this court, "[a]n express contract 'must be manifested by words, either oral or written, which contains agreement and/or mutual assent.'" Frankel v. United States, 118 Fed. Cl. 332, 335 (2014) (alteration added) (quoting Essen Mall Props. v. United States, 21 Cl. Ct. 430, 439 (1990), aff'd, 842 F.3d 1246 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (quoting Webster University v. United States, 20 Cl. Ct. 429, 433 (1990))). In addition to not meeting the requirements to form a contract with the government, plaintiff has failed to meet the requirements of RCFC 9(k).

As indicated above, defendant also argues: "Although the complaint is characterized as asserting a breach-of-contract claim, the crux of Mr. McDermott's complaint is a collateral attack on other Federal Courts." (internal reference omitted). After review of plaintiff's complaint, the court finds plaintiff's various claims of judicial misconduct against a number of unnamed individuals including "lower courts clerks offices and agents" and "inferior court officers and agents as well as defendant officers and agents," brought in this court amount to attempts to requests for review of previously issued federal court judicial decisions in a variety other court proceedings. The United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has repeatedly held that the United States Court of Federal Claims lacks jurisdiction over claims that require the court to scrutinize the decisions of federal courts. See Straw v. United States, 4 F.4th 1358, 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2021) ("[T]he Claims Court does not have jurisdiction to review the decisions of federal district courts." (alteration added)) (citing Petro-Hunt, L.L.C. v. United States, 862 F.3d 1370, 1384–85 (Fed. Cir. 2017)); Shinnecock Indian Nation v. United States, 782 F.3d 1345, 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2015) ("Binding precedent establishes that the Court of Federal Claims has no jurisdiction to review the merits of a decision rendered by a federal district court."); Innovair Aviation Ltd. v. United States, 632 F.3d 1336, 1344 (Fed. Cir.) ("[T]he Court of Federal Claims does not have jurisdiction to review the decision of district courts

(2016)) (alterations added); Int'l Elec. Tech. Corp. v. Hughes Aircraft Co., 476 F.3d 1329, 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

Defendant's motion notes that "Mr. McDermott alleges a breach of contract," and argues plaintiff's "complaint, however, does not allege the elements of contract formation—offer, acceptance, and consideration." (internal reference omitted). Additionally, defendant argues: "Although the complaint is characterized as asserting a breach-of-contract claim, the crux of Mr. McDermott's complaint is a collateral attack on other Federal Courts." (internal reference omitted).

As recently explained by the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit:

There are four requirements to form a contract with the Government: "(1) mutuality of intent to contract; (2) lack of ambiguity in offer and acceptance; (3) consideration; and (4) a government representative having actual authority to bind the United States." Anderson v. United States, 344 F.3d 1343, 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2003). These elements apply to both express and implied-in-fact contracts.

Boyd v. United States, 134 F.4th 1348, 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2025); see also Fairholme Funds, Inc. v. United States, 26 F.4th 1274, 1293-94 (Fed. Cir. 2022), cert. denied, 143 S. Ct. 563 (2023); Columbus Reg'l Hosp. v. United States, 990 F.3d 1330, 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2021); Am. Bankers Ass'n v. United States, 932 F.3d 1375, 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2019); City of Cincinnati v. United States, 153 F.3d 1375, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Plaintiff's complaint does not allege, much less demonstrate any of the four requirements to form a contract with the government identified by the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. As correctly noted by defendant, plaintiff "fails to identify an authorized representative of the United States with whom he entered the alleged contract. Finally, the complaint does not identify the Government's alleged duties arising from the contract, or how the Government breached the contract." (internal reference omitted).

Furthermore, regarding plaintiff's breach of contract claims, according to RCFC 9(k), "[i]n pleading a claim founded on a contract or treaty, a party must identify the substantive provisions of the contract or treaty on which the party relies. In lieu of a description, the party may annex to the complaint a copy of the contract or treaty, indicating the relevant provisions." RCFC (9)(k) (2025). Explaining this requirement, a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims has stated:

Even when a plaintiff properly alleges a contract with the government, the Court of Federal Claims cannot exercise its jurisdiction unless the plaintiff also satisfies the pleading requirements set forth in RCFC 9(k). See, e.g., Baha v. United States, 123 Fed. Cl. 1, 5 n.4 (2015) ("Satisfaction of RCFC 9(k) is a jurisdictional requirement."); see also Huntington Promotional & Supply, LLC v. United States, 114 Fed. Cl. 760, 766 (2014) ("If a plaintiff fails to comply with RCFC 9(k) and to allege sufficient facts to show that it had a contract with the United States, the court cannot exercise jurisdiction

On December 18, 2025, defendant filed a motion to dismiss plaintiff's complaint. As of February 15, 2026, plaintiff has not filed a response to the motion to dismiss although being reminded to do so in two Orders by this court. Plaintiff has attempted to file numerous other confused documents that did not comply with the Rules of the United States Court of Federal Claims, but plaintiff has failed to file the responsive pleading to defendant's motion to dismiss or to address the issues raised by defendant.

The court has rejected several of plaintiff's submissions on November 24, 2025, January 6, 2026, January 26, 2026, and February 4, 2026, and on January 26, 2026, instructed the Clerk's Office of the United States Court of Federal Claims to send a copy of the court's Rules to the plaintiff. Despite plaintiff again not complying with the court's Rules, on February 9, 2026, the court instructed the Clerk's Office to plaintiff's February 6, 2026 submission titled: **"NOW George Mc Dermott THROUGH THESE MOTION PRACTICE OF THIS COURT IN RESPONSE TO A SECRETIVE TEXT MESSAGE RECEIVED 02/05/2026 AND NOT BY EMAIL WHICH INCLUDED A COPY OF COURT DOCKET SHEETS REFLECTED IN ALLEGED ORDER OF 02/04/2026 [ECF 17], WHICH MUST BE CHALLENGED APPELLANT IS PUTTING THE COURT ON NOTICE OF MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THIS ALLEGED ORDER WILL BE FILED SEEKING REVIEW BY THE FULL COURT EXCLUDED SENIOR JUDGE MARIAN BLANK HORN. THIS COURT'S RULES (1), THE RULES OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERALCLAIMS ARE DRAWN UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF 28 U.S.C. §§ 2071(A), (C); 2503(8) (GENERALLY); 2521(A) AND RULES (5)(D) (4)." (capitalization, brackets, and emphasis in original).** Although plaintiff has not filed a formal response to the motion to dismiss, despite plaintiff having been instructed to do so, the court considers the defendant's motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) (2025) of the Rules of the United States Court of Federal Claims (RCFC) and for failure to state a claim pursuant to RCFC 12(b)(6), at this time in order to move the plaintiff's case forward towards a resolution in the trial court.

"Subject-matter jurisdiction may be challenged at any time by the parties or by the court sua sponte." Folden v. United States, 379 F.3d 1344, 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (citing Fanning, Phillips, Molnar v. West, 160 F.3d 717, 720 (Fed. Cir. 1998)), reh'g and reh'g en banc denied (Fed. Cir. 2004), cert. denied, 545 U.S. 1127 (2005); see also St. Bernard Parish Gov't v. United States, 916 F.3d 987, 992–93 (Fed. Cir. 2019) ("[T]he court must address jurisdictional issues, even sua sponte, whenever those issues come to the court's attention, whether raised by a party or not, and even if the parties affirmatively urge the court to exercise jurisdiction over the case." (citing Foster v. Chatman, 578 U.S. 488, 495

docket as a non-party to the underlying proceeding); see also Fry v. Wimbish, No. DKC 14-3875 (D. Md. Dec. 24, 2014) (requesting a copy of the order placing the case under seal but failing to provide contact information); see also Manship v. Sherri Bros., No. 1:11-cv-1003 (JCC/JFA) (E.D. Va. Feb. 16, 2012) (denied motion for production of documents as a non-party).

Plaintiff's litigation history against entities other than the United States includes: McDermott v. Denizen Dev., LLC, No. 22-CV-0658 (D.C. Cir. Aug. 26, 2022) (summarily denied); McDermott v. BB&T Bank Corp., No. 17-7081 (D.C. Cir. Jan. 5, 2018) (affirmed dismissal of plaintiff's case regarding foreclosure of plaintiff's property); Qihui Huang v. Hicks, 418 F. App'x 219 (4th Cir. 2011) (as co-plaintiff with other pro se litigant, affirmed dismissal for failure to state a claim); In re Moore, 33 F. App'x 148 (4th Cir. 2002), cert. denied, 537 U.S. 1148 (2003) (denied appeal to reopen case in district court due to alleged fraud); McDermott v. Moore, No. 98-01800 (4th Cir. June 4, 1998), (affirmed denial of motion for rehearing in bankruptcy court); Heffernan v. Eisner, 2013 WL 4832790 (D.D.C. Sep. 9, 2013) (as co-plaintiff with other pro se litigant, dismissed allegations that employees of the Arlington County Department of Human Services kidnapped and detained a minor); McDermott v. MacFayden, 414 Fed. Appx. 564 (4th Cir.) (denied appeal of district court order denying motion for reconsideration of order to remand to state court), cert. denied, 565 U.S. 831, and reh'g denied, 565 U.S. 1101 (2011); Shield Our Constitutional Rights and Justice v. Hicks, 2009 WL 3747199 (D. Md. Nov. 4, 2009) (as co-plaintiff, dismissed claim under the Freedom of Information Act and Fair Housing Act), recons. denied, 2010 WL 1489997 (D. Md. Apr. 12, 2010); McDermott v. Town of Forest Heights, 2007 WL 9782608 (D. Md. June 8, 2007) (dismissed allegations of violations of the Voting Rights Act), recons. denied, 2007 WL 9782613 (D. Md. Aug. 1, 2007); McDermott v. MacFayden, 2020 WL 865267 (Md. Ct. Spec. App. Feb. 21, 2020) (affirmed lower court regarding a foreclosure auction following plaintiff's tenth notice of appeal).

Plaintiff also unsuccessfully has attempted to intervene in a number of cases, including the following: Gambill v. Jacobs, No. 24-5232 (D.C. Cir. Apr. 3, 2025) (regarding a bankruptcy case); Sammons v. McCarthy, 2023 WL 3002738 (4th Cir. Apr. 19, 2023) (regarding a free speech case); Eveland v. Maryland, 691 F. App'x 111 (4th Cir. 2017) (regarding allegations against the state of Maryland, multiple law firms, an "Alleged Judge," and an attorney); Grenadier ex rel. United States v. Virginia, 696 F. App'x 637 (4th Cir. 2017) (regarding what the lower court described as "an incoherent screed" of a complaint); In re Pawlak, 85 F. App'x 890 (4th Cir. Jan. 15, 2004) (regarding a bankruptcy case); United States v. Russell, 2025 WL 2452413 (D. Md. July 16, 2025) (regarding an action brought by the United States Department of Homeland Security and the United States against Chief Judge George L. Russell III of the United States District Court for the District of Maryland); Ademiluyi v. Albright, No. 8:23-cv-03526 (D. Md. Dec. 29, 2023) (regarding a deprivation of civil rights case); In re Saxon, 2019 WL 1440888 (D.D.C. Mar. 31, 2019) (regarding alleged conspiracy against the Constitution to dilute the United States Treasury), appeal dismissed, 2020 WL 6375156 (D.C. Cir. May 29, 2020); Michaud v. Monger, No. 8:11-cv-00949 (D. Md. Apr. 12, 2011) (regarding an eviction); United States v. Microsoft Corp., No. 1:98-cv-01232 (D.D.C. May 18, 1998) (seeking to intervene and correct the record regarding antitrust litigation against Microsoft); New York v. Microsoft Corp., No. 1:98-cv-01233 (D.D.C. May 18, 1998) (seeking to intervene and correct the record regarding antitrust litigation against Microsoft); see also Mead v. Comm'r of Internal Revenue, No. 22-1039 (D.C. Cir. May 13, 2022) (denied motion for access to Tax Court

28 U.S.C. A. 3002 SECTION 15A & 1603-11")  
Represented by [Jane.Lyons@usdoj.gov](mailto:Jane.Lyons@usdoj.gov). As  
Recorded USCOA-DC-case # 25 - 5096

And

The Corporations Legal Advisors, Trading A  
The American Bar Association Inc.  
Through It Alleged Legal Agent And  
Representatives, Ronald S Flagg with the law firm  
Of Sidley Austin LLP, 1501 K Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005 Phone: + 1 202 736 8000  
Fax: +1 202 736 8711 email [rflagg@Sidley.com](mailto:rflagg@Sidley.com)

Additionally, plaintiff claims a right to a jury trial:<sup>3</sup>

Plaintiff's demand for jury trial on all counts in claims asserted in pursuant to FRCP rule 38 (a) (b) (1) (2). And FRCP rule 39(a) WHEN A DEMAND IS MADE. When a jury trial has been demanded under Rule 38, the action must be designated on the docket as a jury action. The trial on all issues so demanded must be by jury: and plaintiff's demand that the court clerk's office comply with rule 40 which requires the court clerk's office note on the docket jury trial demanded an issue a proper scheduling order to all parties.

The court notes that plaintiff has engaged in extensive litigation against the United States and other parties, and plaintiff's submissions in this court complain about previous cases being "dismissed with unsigned orders."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> The United States Court of Federal Claims is without authority to grant plaintiff's request for a jury trial. "It has long been settled that the Seventh Amendment right to trial by jury does not apply in actions against the Federal Government." Cox v. United States, 105 Fed. Cl. 213, 216 n.10 (quoting Lehman v. Nakshian, 453 U.S. 156, 160 (1981)), appeal dismissed (Fed. Cir. 2012).

<sup>4</sup> Plaintiff's unsuccessful litigation against the United States includes the following: McDermott v. Corp. of the United States Inc., 2025 WL 3034888 (D.D.C. Oct. 27, 2025) (dismissed allegations of antitrust violations); McDermott v. The United States Inc. et al, No. 1:25-cv-01094 (D. Del. Aug. 29, 2025) (dismissed without prejudice); McDermott v. United States, 130 Fed. Cl. 412 (2017) (dismissed case seeking a writ of habeas corpus and an injunction against the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and a Maryland state court), aff'd, 2017 WL 4082033 (Fed. Cir. June 13, 2017); McDermott v. Comm'r of Internal Revenue, No. 17919-02 (T.C. Nov. 15, 2002) (dismissed); McDermott v. Department of Justice, No. 1:98-cv-01235 (D.D.C. May 18, 1998) (dismissed), and aff'd 1998 WL 796141 (D.C. Cir. Oct. 29, 1998), and aff'd, 1998 WL 796141 (D.C. Cir. Mar. 4, 1999); McDermott v. Comm'r of Internal Revenue, No. 014417-93 (T.C. July 7, 1993) (stipulated decision).

## In the United States Court of Federal Claims

\* \* \* \* \*

|                   |   |                          |
|-------------------|---|--------------------------|
| GEORGE MCDERMOTT, | * |                          |
|                   | * |                          |
| Plaintiff,        | * |                          |
| v.                | * | No. 25-1398C             |
|                   | * | Filed: February 15, 2026 |
| UNITED STATES,    | * |                          |
|                   | * |                          |
| Defendant.        | * |                          |
|                   | * |                          |
| * * * * *         | * |                          |

### ORDER

On August 20, 2025, plaintiff filed his complaint in the above captioned case. Plaintiff alleges "Breach of Contract by Corporat[<sup>1</sup>] Defendants Leading 32+ years of Court Corruption. Plaintiff's stated request for relief is to "Restore Plaintfs Right To Jury Trial & Compell Lower Courts Restore Docket." (footnote added). Although the complaint lists the United States as the sole defendant in the case caption, plaintiff's submissions to date identify the "Corporat Defendants" in the case captions as "THE CORPORATION OF THE UNITED STATES INC. through its CORPORATE CEO, DONALD JOHN TRUMP A FOR-PROFIT PRIVATE PUBLICLY TRADED COURP" and the following "RELATED CORPORATE AGENCIES" and "CORPORATE DEFENDANTS ET AL."S:<sup>2</sup>

US DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) 0304  
US DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY 026661067  
US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
US DEPARTMENT OF STATE 026276622  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
(FBI) 878865674  
As defined under ("U.S. code Title

<sup>1</sup> The court notes that plaintiff's complaint was handwritten, and parts of plaintiff's complaint were challenging to read due to plaintiff's handwriting. Capitalization, grammar, punctuation, abbreviations, spelling, emphasis, and choice of words when quoted in this Order are as they originally appear in plaintiff's submissions to this court.

<sup>2</sup> The only proper defendant before the United States Court of Federal Claims is the United States. See 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1) (2024); United States v. Sherwood, 312 U.S. 584, 588 (1941); Jarvis v. United States, 154 Fed. Cl. 712, 717 (2021) ("[I]t is well settled that the United States is the only proper defendant in the Court of Federal Claims.") (alteration added).

Att 11

In The United States Court of Federal Claims  
Form 2  
Cover Sheet

Plaintiff(s) or Petitioner(s)

Names: George M. Devereaux II  
 Location of Plaintiff(s)/Petitioner(s) (city/state): Forest Heights Md 20745

(If this is a multi-plaintiff case, pursuant to RCFC 20(a), please use a separate sheet to list additional plaintiffs.)

Name of the attorney of record (See RCFC 83.1(c)):

Firm Name: George M. Devereaux Pro Per 28 U.S.C. 1654

Contact information for pro se plaintiff/petitioner or attorney of record:

Post Office Box: NA  
 Street Address: 143 N Huron Dr Forest Heights Md 20745  
 City-State-ZIP: 301 996 9577  
 Telephone Number: 301 996 9577  
 E-mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Is the attorney of record admitted to the Court of Federal Claims Bar? ☐ Yes ☒ NoNot Required 28 U.S.C. 1654

Nature of Suit Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Agency Identification Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Select only one (three digit nature of suit code from the attached sheet)

Number of Claims Involved: SEE [ATT 1]Amount Claimed: \$ 30,000,000 as jury may award

(Use estimate if specific amount is not pleaded.)

Bid Protest Case (required for NOS 138 and 140):

Indicate approximate dollar amount of procurement at issue: \$ NAIs plaintiff a small business? ☐ Yes ☒ NoWas this action preceded by the filing of a protest before the GAO? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Solicitation No. \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, was a decision on the merits rendered? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Income Tax (Partnership) Case:

Identify partnership or partnership group: NA

Takings Case:

Specify Location of Property (city/state): P. County Md

Vaccine Case:

Date of Vaccination: NA

Related case:

Is this case directly related to any pending or previously filed case(s) in the United States Court of Federal Claims? If yes, you are required to file a separate notice of directly related case(s). See RCFC 40.2. ☒ Yes ☐ NoSEE [ATT 1]

193

026

RECEIVED - USCFC

AUG 20 2025

AH 12



quest for justice 07 20 25.

Add description



A Quest for Justice August 6, 2025

Let the truth prevail. Our nation's judicial system and legal system has been...



A Quest for Justice August 8, 2025 5

Add description

Petitioner has petitioned this course before only to receive unsigned alleged orders in which court clerk's office is refused to produce the oath of office the purported judges as required under five USC 2902 – 06 clerks offices have refused to produce any evidence that the judges in these prior orders were properly assigned under the judicial selections wheel, no judicial balance of ever been produced, no judicial assignment cards of ever been produced,. In the clerk's offices refused to produce any electronic correspondence from the alleged judges to the clerk's office authorizing dismissal of the case and the illegal use of the court seal. 1700+ other videos are posted in secret justice.com attesting to this fact I pray that this court will finally take action. It can relieve the petitioner of 32 years of title theft, theft of businesses, economic terrorism by corporate attorneys, financial terrorism by corporate attorneys. Covering up for lower court judges and imposters who stole over \$30 million from the petitioner's businesses under the color of law authority.

Petitioner will also invite over 50 victims he has chronicled the stories on over the past 30 years none of those victims or the petitioner have ever been allowed the jury trial required. To appear in open court. And protect our properties in the legal rights. These parties have lost over \$700 million it's time this matter be addressed by this court. Respectfully submitted George Edward McDermott

Page 22

United States Court of Appeals

District of Columbia Circuit  
Washington, D.C. 20001-2866

Clifton B. Cislak  
Clerk

August 8, 2025

General Information  
(202) 216-7000

Angela Caesar, Clerk  
United States District Court  
for the District of Columbia  
333 Constitution Ave., NW  
Washington, D.C. 20001

Attn: Michael Winn

Dear Ms. Caesar:

Enclosed please find correspondence from George McDermott, received in this office on August 4, 2025. The submission appears to be a notice of appeal and a supplement thereto, intended for filing in *McDermott v. Corporation of the United States INC., et al.*, Case No. 1:25-cv-02222-UNA (D.D.C.). Accordingly, this submission is being transmitted to you for appropriate handling.

Sincerely,



Meg Beardsley  
Special Counsel to the Clerk

Enclosure

cc: George McDermott (without enclosure)  
143 N. Huron Drive  
Forest Heights, MD 20745

U. S. BARRETT PRETTYMAN UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE • 333 CONSTITUTION AVENUE, N.W.

Att 14

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
For the District of Columbia

RECEIVED

IN THE MATTER of George K McDermott, Appearing  
under 28 U.S.C. 1654. And as a victim who has been  
Rendered impoverished defendants' agents and  
U.S. Code Title 28 PART V CHAPTER 133 § 1915 (a)  
(1) As an organic citizen not corporate fiction: client

Plaintiff:

DONALD JOHN TRUMPER, The Current CEO of the corporate  
United States Inc. a for-profit private-public trading Corp.  
Duns # 052714966 and his corporate NAMED codeholders,  
who are weaponizing the executive office in violation of  
their separation of state and their LEGAL powers authority.

Defendant:

Civil Action No. 1: - 25 - CV - 02222 - UNA

Plaintiff has designated a jury trial on all facts and  
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38 (FRCP 38) governs the  
right to a jury trial and the process for obtaining one in  
federal civil cases. As a constitutionally protected right  
which defendants must respectfully defend ALL victims.

Please say that again: DEFICIENCY MOTION TO CHIEF JUDGE BOASBURG, since this PLAINTIFF is SEEKING AN  
ORDER DENYING THE CLERK OF THE COURT TO ASSIGN A JUDGE TO THE PROCEEDINGS 1: - 25 - 02222 -  
UNA WHICH IS THE COURT CLERK'S DESIGNATION USED AGAINST PRO SE LITIGANTS AND IFP APPLICANTS

IN AN OVERT ACT TO DENY DUE PROCESS AT ALL AND EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER THE LAW TO OUR CITIZENS  
IN VIOLATION OF FRCP RULE 79 AND 81 OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE ISSUE AN ORDER DENYING IFP  
DESIGNATION IN A FORMAL ORDER THAT PLAINTIFF MAY SEEK RELIEF THROUGH WRIT OF MANDAMUS IN

Now comes George McDermott a natural human being not a corporate fiction here after  
plaintiff the motion practice of this court seeking the assistance of the chief judge of this court the  
Hon. James Boasberg. Seeking assistance his office through a motion to compel culture of the  
court to assign a judge from the judicial assignment wheel as the court clerk's office has failed to do  
so and as plaintiff discovered on July 25 2025 the case is in limbo as no judge has been assigned this  
matter so that a ruling can be made on the IFP request submitted and yet no deficiency notices have  
been noticed since the initial filing on 07/03/2025 and the court is withholding signing summonses  
to the defendant agents and corporate CEOs named in the plaintiff's verified complaint.  
Rule 40.3 indicates your office has control over judicial assignments F.N.I.

Page 2

Page 7

Page 20

AH 15

United States Court of Appeals  
For The District Of Columbia Circuit

No. 25-5096

September Term, 2024

1:25-cv-01235-TPJ

Filed On: June 12, 2025

In re: George E. McDermott,

Petitioner

BEFORE: Katsas, Rao, and Walker, Circuit Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of the petition for writ of mandamus and the supplement thereto; the motion to proceed in forma pauperis; and the motion for other relief, it is

 ORDERED that the motion to proceed in forma pauperis be granted. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion for other relief be denied. Petitioner has not shown an entitlement to any relief. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the petition for writ of mandamus be denied. Petitioner has not demonstrated a clear and indisputable right to any relief. See Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for D.C., 542 U.S. 367, 381 (2004).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.

Per Curiam

Page 6

Page 19

Att-16

corporation, and its acting CEO Darrell John Trump and numerous Jane Does and John Does alleged court agents and officers who for the past 23 years have refused to identify repeatedly. Their legal jurisdiction and authority even after repeated formal request for the clerk's offices to produce the following documents which go to legal standing and jurisdiction of this alleged group of judicial officers agents and assigns hiding behind a alleged cloak of judicial and corporate immunity which no longer exist. Due to agents' malfeasance.

1. In compliance with rule plaintiff acknowledges his duty to file this required notice pursuant to Rule 21. Writ of Mandamus and Prohibition, and Other Extraordinary Writs (a) Mandamus or Prohibition to a Court: Petition, Filing, Service, and Docketing. (2) A party petitioning for a writ of mandamus or prohibition directed to a court must file the petition with the court clerk and serve it on all parties to the proceeding in the trial court. The party must also provide a copy to the trial-court judge. All parties to the proceeding in the trial court other than the petitioner are respondents for all purposes. E.M.1

2. Plaintiff petitioner has already notified clerk's office of the U.S. COA, For the Fourth Circuit of the filing of this petition in accordance with the rules (ATT-1) by certified USPS mail as the case #1-25-CV-2029 in the Maryland USDC - Court Greensbelt involves the same parties and should be consolidated as all clerk's offices are engaged in a conspiracy against legal and civil rights of all pro se litigants for the benefit of the corporate court is corporate CEO Donald John Trump and the other named defendants in this court who are active in violation of their oath of office and knowingly with malice in law, malicious intent, and malice in say to prevent petitioner/plaintiff/intervener which they have engaged in this aversion of the rule of law and their alleged abuse of office, employment contracts, judicial bonds if they have any, which he petitioner now demands that the court clerk's offices preserve for transmittal to the Court of Federal claims all motions pleading papers, election judicial orders. To preserve the record for appeal to the next highest court. Under FRCP rule 10 C, this includes all the filings the decryption of the court have received but have refused to docket in both courts.

Page 2

Page 4

Page 17

Att-17



to assign the judge to after initial filing. Also, to US-COA-DC, CIR. All these cases are related as the defendants are named all have been involved in the 32-year L-4/N-G conspiracy against legal and civil rights of the petitioner, [ATT-1], Latest certificate of service and filing attesting to these notices being filed with the court supplied for the courts review. Notice has been given in accordance with the rules of this court and UCC 1-1-1.2,202, 3-3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.

2. Appellant/petitioner now having put discord on notice and have legally notified on the companion courts and their agents' defendants in all of whom belong to the Bar Association or the corporation involved in the litigation [ATT-7]. Due to the fact that our US Supreme Court clerk's office is engaged in the same misconduct as the court complained about, falsification court records, issuing unsigned unverifiable orders, mistreatment of litigants legal and civil rights, and malice in law by court personnel actions only protecting corporate entities, and in defendants' monopoly on our court system. This court cannot be trusted with administering justice for all, And should be shut down. For failure to provide honest services in accordance with the rule of law.

Respectfully submitted

George E McDermott, Victims' rights advocate, victim of judicial terrorism, or 32 years. All rights reserved UCC 1-1-1.2,202, 3-3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.  
[ATT-1] petitioner's notice in this and other courts of filing of writ of mandamus email verification.

#### Certificate of service.

I George McDermott verify they're trying to correct the attorneys of record at this Court plus all the attorneys and parties of interest who have evidence that the docket has been tampered with two previous filings in case number USDC - MD case # 1: 25-CV-2029 in accordance with the rules of this court is the court all judges have denied motions to IFP applicant to file electronically which equates to economic terrorism. Sent by George McDermott this 15 day of August 2025. Following email addresses. 2025. Following email addresses:  
[jane.lyons@usdcj.us](mailto:jane.lyons@usdcj.us), [stephen@adlawgroup.com](mailto:stephen@adlawgroup.com), [trinity@usdcj.gov](mailto:trinity@usdcj.gov), Zachary Anna Cardin, [elizabeth.heddes@usdcj.gov](mailto:elizabeth.heddes@usdcj.gov), [andrea.hawrysz@clenemurphy.com](mailto:andrea.hawrysz@clenemurphy.com), [nathan.rowan@clenemurphy.com](mailto:nathan.rowan@clenemurphy.com), [paul.clemens@clenemurphy.com](mailto:paul.clemens@clenemurphy.com), [Georgemcdermott2018@gmail.com](mailto:Georgemcdermott2018@gmail.com), [stephen@adlawgroup.com](mailto:stephen@adlawgroup.com), [trinity@usdcj.gov](mailto:trinity@usdcj.gov), [jane.lyons@usdcj.us](mailto:jane.lyons@usdcj.us), [elizabeth.heddes@usdcj.gov](mailto:elizabeth.heddes@usdcj.gov), [andrea.hawrysz@clenemurphy.com](mailto:andrea.hawrysz@clenemurphy.com), [nathan.rowan@clenemurphy.com](mailto:nathan.rowan@clenemurphy.com), [paul.clemens@clenemurphy.com](mailto:paul.clemens@clenemurphy.com), [GeorgeMcDermott2018@gmail.com](mailto:GeorgeMcDermott2018@gmail.com), [stephen@adlawgroup.com](mailto:stephen@adlawgroup.com), [trinity@usdcj.gov](mailto:trinity@usdcj.gov), [jane.lyons@usdcj.us](mailto:jane.lyons@usdcj.us), [elizabeth.heddes@usdcj.gov](mailto:elizabeth.heddes@usdcj.gov), [andrea.hawrysz@clenemurphy.com](mailto:andrea.hawrysz@clenemurphy.com), [nathan.rowan@clenemurphy.com](mailto:nathan.rowan@clenemurphy.com), [paul.clemens@clenemurphy.com](mailto:paul.clemens@clenemurphy.com).

Page 2

Page 15

Att-19



UNITED STATES COURT OF  
(APPEALS)  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

RECEIVED

AUG 15 2025

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

IN THE MATTER of George E McDermott, Appearing  
under 28 U.S.C. 1654 And as a victim who has been  
Kendrick, supervised defendant, against  
133 Civ Title 25 PART V CHAPTER 124 § 1413 (c)  
(1) As an organic crimes not corporate crimes (chris)

This court's case  
number 1:25-cv-5096-1FP  
to be assigned from District Court  
which appeal emanates from

Civil Action No. 1:25-cv-02222-UNA

DONALD JOHN TRUMP, The Current CEO of the corporate  
United States Inc. a for-profit private public trading Corp.  
Duns #052714966 and his corporate NAJBLU codebook  
who are weapon using the executive office in violation of  
their separation of state and their LEGAL powers authority

Plaintiff has demanded a jury trial on all counts and  
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 38 (FRCP 38) governs the  
right to a jury trial and the process for demanding one in  
federal civil cases. As a constitutionally protected right  
would be violated assets repeatedly denied ALL victims

APPELLANT /petitioner REQUIRED NOTICE TO THIS COURT OF FILING A PETITION FOR  
MANDAMUS AND EXTRAORDINARY RELIEF UNDER FRCP RULE 21 (1). NOTICE IS  
REQUIRED UNDER THE ALL-WRITS ACT, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) PUTTING THIS COURT  
OFFICIALLY ON RECORD AS IT THIS COURT CLERK'S OFFICE APPEARS TO BE JOINING  
THE SUBVERSIVE ACTS OF THE DEFENDANT CORPORATIONS TREATING THE U.S.A. INC.  
A.K.A. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC. THROUGH ITS ALLEGED CURRENT CEO  
DONALD JOHN TRUMP AT AL-AS DE FACTO PRESIDENT OF THE CORPORATION, OF THE  
UNITED STATES INC.  
FILING BEING MADE IN US COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS DC COURT.

Now comes George McDermott solution practice of this court officially notifying this court  
that all current and pending cases in this court are being subject to review of the United States Ct. of  
Federal claims as it appears that this court and its officers' agents and assigns. Are now engaged in a  
RICO criminal/civil conspiracy against the legal rights of appellants and all other pro se litigants right  
to equal justice and equal protection under the law through a reckless pattern that has a 32-year history  
in the state federal court systems and District of Columbia court system, just as the recent June 12,  
2025 alleged order in decisions of this Court memorialize. And the court refused to entertain or  
respond to production and often the indication of any of the orders judgments and decrees. Siding  
with the named defendants, their corporate superiors, violation of the rule of law

1. Appellant is required to notify this court of intent to file a writ of mandamus which appellant  
has done. Through this filing which is supported by filings made in the US - COA - 4<sup>th</sup> circuit. Also,  
FBI. The United States Court of Federal Claims is a court of record with national jurisdiction. The United States  
Court of Federal Claims was recreated in October 1982 by the Federal Courts Improvement Act pursuant to  
Article 1 of the United States Constitution. ICQFCI has nationwide jurisdiction to hear claims for monetary  
damages against the federal government based on the Constitution. Case involves first impression law Question

Page 14

AH-20

Nature-of-Suit Codes for General Jurisdiction Cases

|                                          |                                                |                                                    |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| 100 Contract - Construction - (CDA)      | 206 Tax - Excise                               | 354 Military Pay - SBP                             |
| 102 Contract - Fail to Award - (CDA)     | 208 Tax - Gift                                 | 355 Military Pay - CRSC                            |
| 104 Contract - Lease - (CDA)             | 210 Tax - Income Corporate                     | 356 Military Pay - Other                           |
| 106 Contract - Maintenance - (CDA)       | 212 Tax - Income Individual                    |                                                    |
| 108 Contract - Renovation - (CDA)        | 213 Tax - Income Individual Partnership        | 366 Carrier - transportation                       |
| 110 Contract - Repair - (CDA)            | 214 Tax - Informer's Fees                      | 367 Copyright                                      |
| 112 Contract - Sale - (CDA)              | 216 Tax - Proposer's Penalty                   | 368 Native American                                |
| 114 Contract - Service - (CDA)           | 218 Tax - Railroad                             | 369 Oil Spill Clean Up                             |
| 116 Contract - Supply - (CDA)            | 219 Tax - Retirement Unemployment Tax Act      | 370 Taking - Town Bluff Dam                        |
| 118 Contract - Other - (CDA)             | 220 Tax - TEFRA Partnership - 28.1568          | 371 Patent                                         |
|                                          | 222 Tax - Windfall Profit Occupancy - Interest | 372 Taking - Addicks & Barker Reservoir            |
| 120 Contract - Bailment                  | 224 Tax - 1875 Penalty - 206012 Wildlife       | 373 Taking - Personality                           |
| 122 Contract - Bid Preparation Costs     | 226 Tax - Other                                | 374 Taking - Realty                                |
| 124 Contract - Medicare Act              |                                                | 375 Taking - Rails to Trails                       |
| 126 Contract - Realty Sale               |                                                | 376 Taking - Other                                 |
| 128 Contract - Subsidy                   |                                                | 377 Unjust Conviction and Imprisonment             |
| 130 Contract - Surety                    |                                                | 378 Miscellaneous - Damages                        |
| 132 Contract - Timber Sale               | 380 Civilian Pay - Back Pay                    | 379 Miscellaneous - Affordable Care Act            |
| 134 Contract - Other                     | 382 Civilian Pay - CDA                         | 380 Miscellaneous - Lease                          |
|                                          | 383 Civilian Pay - Disability Annuity          | 381 Miscellaneous - Mineral Leasing Act            |
| 136 Contract - Other - Wiederlich        | 384 Civilian Pay - FLSA                        | 382 Miscellaneous - Oyster Growers Damages         |
|                                          | 386 Civilian Pay - Overseas Compensation       | 383 Miscellaneous - Safety Off. Ben. Act           |
| 138 Contract - Protest (Pre Award)       | 388 Civilian Pay - Reimburse Expenses          | 384 Miscellaneous - Royalty/Penalty Gas Production |
| 140 Contract - Protest (Post Award)      | 390 Civilian Pay - Suspension Award            | 385 Miscellaneous - Other                          |
|                                          | 392 Civilian Pay - Other                       | 386 Informer's Reward                              |
| 200 Tax - Allowance of Interest          |                                                | 387 Special Nuclear Fuel                           |
| 202 Tax - Declaratory Judgment - 28.1567 | 340 Military Pay - Back Pay                    |                                                    |
| 204 Tax - Estate                         | 342 Military Pay - CHAMPVA                     |                                                    |
|                                          | 344 Military Pay - Court records               |                                                    |
|                                          | 346 Military Pay - Covered Veterans            |                                                    |
|                                          | 348 Military Pay - Reimbursement               |                                                    |
|                                          | 350 Military Pay - Reimburse Expenses          |                                                    |
|                                          | 352 Military Pay - Retirement                  |                                                    |

Nature-of-Suit Codes for Vaccine Cases

|                                     |                                    |                                  |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 449 Injury - Hepatitis A            | 481 Injury - Hemophilus influenza  | 477 Death - Pertussis            |
| 453 Injury - Pneumococcal Conjugate | 486 Injury - Varicella             | 478 Death - Polio - inactive     |
| 456 Injury - DPT & Polio            | 489 Injury - Rotavirus             | 479 Death - Polio - other        |
| 457 Injury - DT                     | 492 Injury - Unintended            | 480 Death - Rubella              |
| 458 Injury - DTP/DPT                | 494 Injury - Influenza (Flu)       | 481 Death - Tetanus & Diphtheria |
| 459 Injury - Measles                | 496 Injury - Meningococcal         | 482 Death - Tetanus & Tox.       |
| 460 Injury - MMR                    | 498 Injury - Human Papillomavirus  | 483 Death - Other                |
| 461 Injury - Measles/Rubella        |                                    | 484 Death - Hepatitis B          |
| 462 Injury - Mumps                  | 492 Death - Hepatitis A            | 485 Death - Hemophilus influenza |
| 463 Injury - Pertussis              | 494 Death - Pneumococcal Conjugate | 486 Death - Varicella            |
| 464 Injury - Polio - inactive       | 470 Death - BPT & Polio            | 487 Death - Rotavirus            |
| 465 Injury - Polio - other          | 471 Death - DT                     | 488 Death - Thimerosal           |
| 466 Injury - Rubella                | 472 Death - DTP/DPT                | 489 Death - Influenza (Flu)      |
| 467 Injury - Tetanus & Diphtheria   | 473 Death - Measles                | 490 Death - Meningococcal        |
| 468 Injury - Tetanus & Tox.         | 474 Death - MMR                    | 491 Death - Human Papillomavirus |
| 469 Injury - Other                  | 475 Death - Measles/Rubella        |                                  |
| 484 Injury - Hepatitis B            | 476 Death - Mumps                  |                                  |

A-21

**In The United States Court of Federal Claims**  
**Form 2**  
**Cover Sheet**

**Plaintiff(s) or Petitioner(s)**Names: George Mc Dermott Sr natural living human being not a corporate fictionLocation of Plaintiff(s)/Petitioner(s) (c) 143 N. Huron Dr., Oxon Hill, MD 20745Single  
plaintiff

If this is a multi-plaintiff case, provide the RCFC 20A.21, please use a separate sheet for each additional plaintiff(s).

Name of the attorney of record (See RCFC 83.1(c)): Appearing pro se 28 USC 1654 statute.Firm Name: No firm or dishonest disreputable attorney for petitioner respondent's unknown

Contact information for pro se plaintiff/petitioner or attorney of record:

Post Office Box:

Street Address:

City-State-ZIP:

Telephone Number:

E-mail Address:

George Edward Mc Dermott 143 N. Huron Dr., Forest Heights, MD

20745 phone contact (301) 996-9577.

Email [Georgemcdermitt2018@gmail.com](mailto:Georgemcdermitt2018@gmail.com).Website [GeorgeMcDermott.com](http://GeorgeMcDermott.com) and [McDermottforMD.com](http://McDermottforMD.com)Is the attorney of record admitted to the Court of Federal Claims Bar? ☐ Yes ☒ NoNature of Suit Code: 440 civil rights denied

Agency Identification Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Indicate on three digit number in suit type box.

Number of Claims Involved: \_\_\_\_\_

Amount Claimed: \$ 45 million compensatory plus punitive and exemplary damagesUse estimate if specific amount is not possible.

Bid Protest Case (required for NOS 135 and 140):

Indicate approximate dollar amount of procurement at issue: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Is plaintiff a small business? ☐ Yes ☒ NoWas this action preceded by the filing of a ☐ Yes ☒ No

Solicitation No. \_\_\_\_\_

protest before the GAO?

If yes, was a decision on the merits rendered? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Income Tax (Partnership) Case:

Identify partnership or partnership group:

Defendants involved in conspiracy beginning

1995 theft of \$2 million business by CT insiders

Takings Case:

Specify Location of Property (city/state):

Defendants theft of titles to business and

personal residence of the plaintiff/petitioner  
through judicial terrorism, obstruction of justice  
and falsification court records by defendants

Vaccine Case:

Date of Vaccination: Not applicable

Related case:

Is this case directly related to any pending or previously filed  
case(s) in the United States Court of Federal Claims? ☒ Yes ☐ Noare required to file a separate notice of directly related case(s). See 28 USC 1654.

015

AA-22

Your daytime telephone no.: 301-996-9577

Your age: 80 years of June 12, 2025

Your social security no.: 579-56- 6594

Your years of schooling: 7 years total

March 27, 2025

Date

Signature



Printed name

George Edward Mc Dermott

Address

143 N. Huron Dr. Forest Heights, MD 20745

Telephone number

301-996-9577, and George.mcdermott2018@gmail.com

Email address

Make a copy of this form before you fill it in.

Att-23  
Post Office

9. Do you expect any major changes to your monthly income or expenses or in your assets or liabilities during the next 12 months?

☒ YES ☐ NO If yes, describe on an attached sheet.

10. Have you paid - or will you be paying- an attorney any money for services in connection with this case, including the completion of this form?

☐ YES ☒ NO If yes, how much? \$ No no such thing as an honest attorney

If yes, state the attorney's name, address, and telephone number:

Explanation. Petitioner is a victim of 25+ years of legal and JUDICIAL

Abuse by unlicensed foreign agents pretending to be attorneys and judicial officers

Who have no respect for the rule of law the Constitution or their oath of office

11. Have you paid, or will you be paying, anyone other than an attorney (such as a paralegal or a typist) any money for services in connection with this case, including the completion of this form?

☐ YES ☒ NO If yes, how much? \$ Petitioner's pro se

If yes, state the attorney's name, address, and telephone number:

Explanation. Petitioner was forced to become a self represented party

\*A State cannot exclude a person from the practice of law or from any other occupation in a

manner so discriminatory that constitutes the Due Process or Equal Protection (350 U.S. 202, 255) - Exclusion of the Petitioner's Grounds:

12. Provide any other information that will help explain why you cannot pay the docket fees for your appeal.

Court records attest petitioner is a crime victim he/she had reported defendant's/respondent's

agents had stolen millions of dollars petitioner's assets for five dollars in 94 with forged documents

13. State the address of your legal residence.

143 N. Huron Dr., Forest Heights, MD 20745 property of which petitioner

paid off in 1995. And the Mafia court insiders secretly recorded \$600,000 in illegal judgments against

petitioner's property in 1995 secretly while committing fraud on the court and petitioner

9. Do you expect any major changes to your monthly income or expenses or in your assets or liabilities during the next 12 months?

☒ YES ☐ NO If yes, describe on an attached sheet.

10. Have you paid - or will you be paying- an attorney any money for services in connection with this case, including the completion of this form?

☐ YES ☒ NO If yes, how much? \$ No no such thing as an honest attorney

If yes, state the attorney's name, address, and telephone number:

Explanation. Petitioner is a victim of 25+ years of legal and JUDICIAL  
Abuse by unlicensed foreign agents pretending to be attorneys and judicial officers  
Who have no respect for the rule of law the Constitution or their oath of office

11. Have you paid, or will you be paying, anyone other than an attorney (such as a paralegal or a typist) any money for services in connection with this case, including the completion of this form?

☐ YES ☒ NO If yes, how much? \$ Petitioner's pro se

If yes, state the attorney's name, address, and telephone number:

Explanation. Petitioner was forced to become a self represented party

\*A State cannot exclude a person from the practice of law or from any other occupation in a

matter or for reasons that interfere the Due Process or Equal Protection (53 U.S.C. 252, 254) (Guarantee of the Fourteenth Amendment)

12. Provide any other information that will help explain why you cannot pay the docket fees for your appeal.

Court records attest petitioner is a crime victim who had reported defendant's/respondent's  
agents had stolen millions of dollars petitioner's assets for five dollars in 94 with forged documents

13. State the address of your legal residence.

143 N. Huron Dr., Forest Heights, MD 20745 property of which petitioner  
paid off in 1995. And the Mafia court insiders secretly recorded \$600,000 in illegal judgments against  
petitioner's property in 1995 secretly while committing fraud on the court and petitioner

4. How much cash do you and your spouse have? \$ \$125 to the end of the month

Below, state any money you or your spouse have in bank accounts or in any other financial institution.

| <u>Financial institution</u> | <u>Type of account</u> | <u>Amount you have</u> | <u>Amount your spouse has</u> |
|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Checking account             |                        | \$ \$62.50             | \$ \$62.50                    |
| No savings account           |                        | \$                     | \$                            |
| No securities                |                        | \$                     | \$                            |

If you are a prisoner, you must attach a statement certified by the appropriate institutional officer showing all receipts, expenditures, and balances during the last six months in your institutional accounts. If you have multiple accounts, perhaps because you have been in multiple institutions, attach one certified statement of each account.

5. List the assets, and their values, which you own or your spouse owns. Do not list clothing and ordinary household furnishings.

| <u>Home (Value)</u>                          | <u>Other Real Estate (Value)</u>       | <u>Motor Vehicle #1 (Value)</u> |
|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Unknown                                      | Encumbered by illegal judgments        | Make & Year: _____              |
| Encumbered by \$600,000 of illegal judgments | By Mafia and courts Agents             | Model: _____                    |
|                                              | Who stole all of petitioner's business | Registration No.: _____         |
| <u>Other assets</u>                          | <u>Other assets</u>                    | <u>Motor Vehicle #2 (Value)</u> |
| Household furniture 50 years old             | None                                   | Make & Year: _____              |
| All business assets liquidated               | None                                   | Model: _____                    |
| To pay for legal defenses                    | None                                   | Registration No.: _____         |

6. State every person, business, or organization owing you or your spouse money, and the amount owed.

| <u>Person(s) owing you or your spouse money</u>                          | <u>Amount owed to you</u> | <u>Amount owed to your spouse</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Petitioner has no outstanding loans or income give to judicial terrorism | \$ Zero                   | \$ Zero                           |
| Outstanding loans From family members \$20,000 borrowed                  | \$ Zero                   | \$ Zero                           |
| To pay house taxes and living expenses due to 25 years of legal abuse    | \$ Zero                   | \$ Zero                           |

7. State the persons who rely on you or your spouse for support.

| <u>Name</u>                                             | <u>Relationship</u>                     | <u>Age</u> |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|------------|
| George Edward McDermott Junior                          | Son Borrowed \$15,000 approximately     | 56         |
| Mary Ellen McDermott                                    | Daughter Borrowed \$6,000 approximately | 59         |
| Jeannie Murray McDermott                                | Daughter Borrowed \$6,000 approximately | 54         |
| Children had to borrow money from to pay for healthcare | Prohibit the financial resources from   |            |

Statement of Assets and Liabilities

Page 1 of 1

1. For both you and your spouse estimate the average amount of money received from each of the following sources during the past 12 months. Adjust any amount that was received weekly, biweekly, quarterly, semiannually, or annually to show the monthly rate. Use gross amounts, that is, amounts before any deductions for taxes or otherwise.

| Income source                                                        | Average monthly amount during the past 12 months |           | Amount expected next month |         |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|---------|
|                                                                      | You                                              | Spouse    | You                        | Spouse  |
| Employment                                                           | \$ Retired                                       | \$ \$1700 | \$ Same                    | \$ Same |
| Self-employment                                                      | \$ None                                          | \$ Zero   | \$ Same                    | \$ Same |
| Income from real property (such as rental income)                    | \$ None                                          | \$ Zero   | \$ Same                    | \$ Same |
| Interest and dividends                                               | \$ None                                          | \$ Zero   | \$ Same                    | \$ Same |
| Gifts                                                                | \$ None                                          | \$ Zero   | \$ Same                    | \$ Same |
| Alimony                                                              | \$ None                                          | \$ Zero   | \$ Same                    | \$ Same |
| Child support                                                        | \$ None                                          | \$ Zero   | \$ Same                    | \$ Same |
| Retirement (such as social security, pensions, annuities, insurance) | \$ \$1981                                        | \$ \$1790 | \$ Same                    | \$ Same |
| Disability (such as social security, insurance payments)             | \$ \$185                                         | \$ \$180  | \$ Same                    | \$ Same |
| Unemployment payments                                                | \$ Zero                                          | \$ Zero   | \$ Same                    | \$ Same |
| Public assistance (such as welfare)                                  | \$ Zero                                          | \$ Zero   | \$ Same                    | \$ Same |
| Other (specify):                                                     | \$ Zero                                          | \$ Zero   | \$ Same                    | \$ Same |
| Total monthly income:                                                | \$ \$1769                                        | \$ \$1610 | \$ Same                    | \$ Same |

2. List your employment history, most recent employer first. (Gross monthly pay is before taxes or other deductions.)

| Employer       | Address        | Dates of Employment | Gross Monthly Pay |
|----------------|----------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Not applicable | Not applicable | Retired             | \$ Retired        |
|                |                |                     | \$                |
|                |                |                     | \$                |

3. List your spouse's employment history, most recent employer first. (Gross monthly pay is before taxes or other deductions.)

| Employer       | Address        | Dates of Employment | Gross Monthly Pay |
|----------------|----------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable      | \$ Not applicable |
|                |                |                     | \$                |
|                |                |                     | \$                |

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

George McDermott

v.

DOJ/ABA corporate et al

Case No. 1:98- CV- 1235 TPJ

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL IN FORMA PAUPERIS

Affidavit in Support of Motion

I swear or affirm under penalty of perjury that, because of my poverty, I cannot prepay the docket fees of my appeal or post a bond for them. I believe I am entitled to redress. I swear or affirm under penalty of perjury under United States laws that my answers on this form are true and correct. (28 U.S.C. § 1746; 18 U.S.C. § 1621.)

March 27, 2025

Date

  
Signature

Instructions

Complete all questions in this application and then sign it. Do not leave any blanks: if the answer to a question is "0," "none," or "not applicable (N/A)," write in that response. If you need more space to answer a question or to explain your answer, attach a separate sheet of paper identified with your name, your case number, and the question being answered.

My issues on appeal are:

Petition for writ of mandamus to compel the court

Its officers and agents and assigns to produce

Verification of alleged orders judgments and decrees

And all electronic communications from the legs Judge's chambers to the clerk's office

Authorizing the preparation and filing of purported unsigned unverifiable

Judicial decrees Judgment orders Violating FRCP rule 79

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

George McDermott

v.

DOJ/ABA corporate et al

Case No. 1:98- CV- 1235 TPJ

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL IN FORMA PAUPERIS

Affidavit in Support of Motion

I swear or affirm under penalty of perjury that, because of my poverty, I cannot prepay the docket fees of my appeal or post a bond for them. I believe I am entitled to redress. I swear or affirm under penalty of perjury under United States laws that my answers on this form are true and correct. (28 U.S.C. § 1746; 18 U.S.C. § 1621.)

March 27, 2025

Date

  
Signature

Instructions

Complete all questions in this application and then sign it. Do not leave any blanks: if the answer to a question is "0," "none," or "not applicable (N/A)," write in that response. If you need more space to answer a question or to explain your answer, attach a separate sheet of paper identified with your name, your case number, and the question being answered.

My issues on appeal are:

Petition for writ of mandamus to compel the court

Its officers and agents and assigns to produce

Verification of alleged orders judgments and decrees

And all electronic communications from the legs Judge's chambers to the clerk's office

Authorizing the preparation and filing of purported unsigned unverifiable

Judicial decrees Judgment orders Violating FRCP rule 79

United States Court of Appeals  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 25-5096

September Term, 2024

1:25-cv-01398-SPJ

Filed On: June 12, 2025

In re: George E. McDermott,

Respondent

BEFORE: Katzev, Rubin, and Walker, Circuit Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of the petition for writ of mandamus and the supplement thereto; the motion to proceed in forma pauperis; and the motion for other relief, it is

ORDERED that the motion to proceed in forma pauperis be granted. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion for other relief be denied. Respondent has not shown an entitlement to any relief. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the petition for writ of mandamus be denied. Respondent has not demonstrated a clear and indisputable right to any relief. See *Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for D.C.*, 542 U.S. 367, 381 (2004).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 35, this disposition will not be published.

For Courtroom

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Plaintiff served the defendant's only new agents by the email addresses furnished by the court this third day of July 2025 so

Plaintiff Certificate Of Service. Certifying delivery of this motion paper by electronic means to the only 2 noted defendant attorneys for the (HSA) and department of justice, et al, after 25 years of request the court has never produced any other evidence of defendant's having agents other than Jane Lyons for the DOJ et al or Jane Lyons@usdoj.gov and (HSA's) only no legal contact. Ronald S flag at Sydney Austin LLP Email at [ronaldsflag@sydneyaustin.com](mailto:ronaldsflag@sydneyaustin.com) in 27 years plaintiff has never met a representative of either of these defendants, served this July 3, 2025 by email \_\_\_\_\_

3. Petitioner asserted that notice was given to all courts below and now presents this court with evidence [ATT. 4] date stamped copies cannot be refuted in the course must take judicial notice of them as proof of the official record.

#### IN SUMMATION

petitioner respectfully request that this court issue a case number given that the motion for IFP is pending and writ of mandamus will be filed with this court irrespective of the outcome of the IFP application being approved and petitioner will await the court response

Respectfully submitted



Petitioner George E McDermott all rights reserved universal commercial code articles 1-101, 102, 202, 3-3, 306-08 the Constitution and declaration of rights as published by the GPO offices as the true and correct law of the land of these United States of America.

#### ATTACHMENTS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR WAIVER OF FEES AND ISSUANCE OF A CASE NUMBER AS PETITIONER HAS FILED THIS MOTION IN GOOD FAITH.

| [ATT. #] | Description of document to present the record for appeal                                                                                                           | Date       | Page #        |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|
| [ATT. 1] | Proof IFP was granted DC Court of Appeals 06/12/2025                                                                                                               | 07/03/2025 | Page 4        |
| [ATT. 2] | IFP application approved US Court of Appeals DC circuit after District Court obstructed justice                                                                    | 03/27/2025 | Pages 5 – 11  |
| [ATT. 3] | Cover sheet required by Court of Federal claims complete                                                                                                           | 08/19/2025 | Pages 12 – 13 |
| [ATT. 4] | Proof of notification to lower courts under FRCP rule 21 and 28 USC §1651 (a)                                                                                      | 08/15/2025 | Pages 14 – 20 |
| [ATT. 5] | Formal notice special counsel to the court clerk DC – COA acknowledging chief clerk Angela Cesar notice of appeal filed yet both records refused to docket filings | 09/08/2025 | Page – 21     |
| [ATT. 6] | Video proof filings were made but not docketed                                                                                                                     | 07/20/2025 | Page – 22     |

Certificate of service all parties served by electronic means at the addresses listed below this 20th day of August 2025 in accordance with the rules of this court served by  to all corporate representatives having interest and are ljane.lyons@usdoj.go, stephen@sdsllaw.us, brenda j. t.moore@usdoj.gov, Zachary Aaro, Cardin, isted brendan.t.moore@usdoj.gov, Zachary Aaron as parties him to be served Cardin, elizabeth.t.hedges@usdoj.gov, andrew.lawrence@clementmurphy.com, matthew.rowen@clementmurphy.com, paul.clement@clementmurphy.com, Georgericdermott2018@gmail.com, stephen@sdsllaw.us, pkahn@wc.com, mprebil@wc.com, hmstichel@rkwlawgroup.com, sklepper@kg-law.com, hmstichel@rkwlawgroup.com, maicholson@wc.com, mprebil@wc.com, lblatt@wc.com

006

Page 3

Att-31

Comes now George McDermott hereafter petitioner through the motion practice in this court seeking a ruling on this court as to whether petitioner can proceed IFP in this action which is necessitated by the lower courts clerks offices and agents coordinated malicious misconduct by obstructing justice and petitioner's access to the courts while refusing to docket pleadings which have been the stent into the record, failing to keep full and complete docket as required under FRCP rule 1, 3, 79, 81. ("Where there is clear evidence on the record").

1. Petitioner has chosen out of an abundance of caution to further petition the court and the clerk's office for this court through the motion practice to make a ruling as to whether petitioner will be allowed to proceed IFP which was granted on June 12 2025 by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia [ATT. 1] which states and I quote ("ORDER THAT THE MOTION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS IS GRANTED"). Petitioner is also including a copy of the IFP application which the court ruled on out of an abundance of caution. [ATT. 2].

2. Petitioner out of an abundance of caution is also included a filled out court form 2 which is in compliance with court rules [ATT. 3]. Along with proof that all of the lower courts involved in this unnecessary petition for writ of mandamus were notified as required under the rules of this court that this action would be taken. [ATT. 4]. Unfortunately all of the court dockets below have been tampered with and these motion papers were never filed along with the vast majority of other motion papers filed by the petitioner in the lower courts, in direct violation of FRCP rule 1, 3, 77, 78, 79. And anyone would necessitated this filing taken will await the court's ruling on this IFP application. Having no access to his funds. If court denies the application. Petitioner is hoping to be able to sell his blood plasma in order to pay the filing fee as this matter must be resolved. In accordance with the Constitution and Bill of Rights which have been egregiously violated by the improper actions of the lower courts. Who refused to provide other services to our citizens.

Petitioner/appellant/plaintiff had a right to a jury trial, *Pernell v. Southhall Realty*, 416 U.S. 363(1974), "Parties whose rights are to be affected are entitled to be heard; and in order that they may enjoy that right they must be notified. It is equally fundamental that the right to notice and an opportunity to be heard must be granted at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner." This court succinctly defined *Luger v. Edmondson Oil Company* 457 U. S. 922, a similar case to the case at bar, stating: 42 USC 1983

005

Att 32

Page 2

**In The United States Court of Federal Claims  
717 Madison Pl NW, Washington, DC 20439**

In the matter of George E. McDermott  
143 N. Huron Dr.  
Forest Heights, MD 20745  
Phone (301) 996-9577  
email [Georgemcdermott2018@gmail.com](mailto:Georgemcdermott2018@gmail.com)

HERE AFTER PLAINTIFF et al  
Vs.

THE CORPORATION OF THE UNITED STATES INC.  
through its CORPORATE CEO. DONALD JOHN TRUMP  
A FOR-PROFIT PRIVATE PUBLICLY TRADED CORP.  
DUNS #'S UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT 052714196\*

And Its RELATED CORPORATE AGENCIES  
US DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) 030421397  
US DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY 026661067  
US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
US DEPARTMENT OF STATE 026276622  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
(FBI) 878865674.

As defined under ("U.S. code Title  
28 U.S.C. A. 3002 SECTION 15A & 1603-11").

Represented by [Jane.Lyons@usdoj.gov](mailto:Jane.Lyons@usdoj.gov). As  
Recorded USCOA-DC-case # 25 - 5096

And

The Corporations Legal Advisors, Trading A.  
The American Bar Association Inc.  
Through It Alleged Legal Agent And  
Representatives. Ronald S Flagg with the law firm  
of Sidley Austin LLP, 1501 K Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005 Phone: + 1 202 736 8000  
Fax: +1 202 736 8711 email [rflagg@Sidley.com](mailto:rflagg@Sidley.com)

CORPORATE DEFENDANTS ET AL.'s \*

\* CASE No. \_\_\_\_\_

\* Plaintiffs demand for jury trial on all  
\* counts in claims asserted in pursuant  
\* to FRCP rule 38 (a) (b) (1) (2). And  
\* FRCP rule 39 (a) WHEN A  
\* DEMAND IS MADE. When a jury  
\* trial has been demanded under Rule  
\* 38, the action must be designated on  
\* the docket as a jury action. The trial  
\* on all issues so demanded must be by  
\* jury; and plaintiff's demand that the  
\* court clerk's office comply with rule  
\* 40 which requires the court clerk's  
\* office note on the docket jury trial  
\* demanded an issue a proper  
\* scheduling order to all parties.

\* Plaintiff will be proceeding IFP  
\* which was approved 06/17/2025  
\* received 06/20/2025 In-related case  
\* USCOA-DC.CIR. Case No. 25 -  
\* 5096 which necessitated this action  
\* due to named corporate defendants'  
\* agents monopolistic, malfeasance  
\* malice in law, malice in say assault  
\* on the rule of law/OUR Constitution.

\*\*\*\*\*  
PLAINTIFF George McDermott /PETITIONER'S OFFICIAL MOTION/ NOTIFICATION TO  
THIS COURT THAT HE IS SEEKING A WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND EXTRAORDINARY  
RELIEF UNDER FRCP RULE 21 (1). NOTICE IS REQUIRED UNDER THE ALL-WRITS ACT, 28  
U.S.C. § 1651(A) MANDAMUS TO COMPEL INFERIOR COURT OFFICERS AND AGENTS AS  
WELL AS DEFENDANT OFFICERS AND AGENTS DIVULGE THEIR JURISDICTION AND  
AUTHORITY TO ENGAGE IN THE ONGOING MALICIOUS CRIMINAL/CIVIL VIOLATIONS  
OF THEIR OUT OF OFFICE, THE JUDICIAL BONDS, AND THEIR OVERT ACTS OF JUDICIAL  
CORPORATE FALSIFICATION OF COURT RECORDS, MALICIOUS ACTS OF DESTROYING  
COURT DOCUMENTS, AND MOUTH FOR THESE ACTS OF ISSUING KNOWINGLY  
FRAUDULENT UNSIGNED ORDERS WHICH FOR THE PAST 32 YEARS NO COURT HAS  
RESPONDED TO NUMEROUS CERTIFICATIONS OF A QUESTION OF LAW AS TO THEIR  
LEGAL JURISDICTION, CAPACITY, AND AUTHORITY

*[ATT-1]*  
*AH-33*

5. RELIEF. Briefly state exactly what you want the court to do for you.

Restore Plaintiffs Right to Jury Trial  
A Compell Lower Courts Restore Docket

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signed this 20 day of August 2025  
(day) (month) (year)

  
Signature of Plaintiff(s)

Att-34<sup>AT</sup>

2. PARTIES

Plaintiff, George McTarnutt resides at 143N Huron Dr First Hight  
(Street Address) 2074  
301 996 9577  
(City, State, ZIP Code) (Telephone Number)

If more than one plaintiff, provide the same information for each plaintiff below.

Defendants all listed Engrat Insiders  
SEE [ATT 1]

3. PREVIOUS LAWSUITS. Have you begun other lawsuits in the United States Court of Federal Claims? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please list cases: ALL Cases Alleged Dismissed  
With Unsigned Orders Engrat Will. Valtant

4. STATEMENT OF THE CLAIM. State as briefly as possible the facts of your case. Describe how the United States is involved. You must state exactly what the United States did, or failed to do, that has caused you to initiate this legal action. Be as specific as possible and use additional paper as necessary.

Breach of Contract By  
Engrat Defendants Leading 32+ years  
of Court Corruption That George  
Violating Every Law  
He Listed in 2024 Code of  
Laws By US Cop Office  
See [ATT 1] for Complete Record

A-6

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

George Mc Dermott  
143 N. Mendenhall Dr. Forest Heights MD

25-1398C

Plaintiff(s),

Case No.

v.

Judge

THE UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

COMPLAINT

Your complaint must be clearly handwritten or typewritten, and you must sign and declare under penalty of perjury that the facts are correct. If you need additional space, you may use another blank page. A fillable pdf is available at <http://uscfc.uscourts.gov/filing-a-complaint>.

If you intend to proceed without the prepayment of filing fees (*in forma pauperis* (IFP)), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, you must file along with your complaint an application to proceed IFP.

I. **JURISDICTION.** State the grounds for filing this case in the United States Court of Federal Claims. The United States Court of Federal Claims has limited jurisdiction (*see e.g.*, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1491-1509).

20 Page Complaint Attd  
[ATT-1] Court Cost to Federal Not  
of Fee \$201

RECEIVED - USCFC

AUG 20 2025

A-5

001

ATT-56

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Exhibit 1: *Pro se* complaint filed by George McDermott in the United States Court of Federal Claims on August 20, 2025, case no. 25-1398.
- Exhibit 2: Order dated February 15, 2026, dismissing complaint in case no. 25-1398 for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.