

JUN 09 2026

**IN THE CORPORATE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT – DC**

IN THE MATTER OF

George Edward McDermott. An organic human being not a corporate fiction having been sold into slavery by the corporate defendants and their agents as chattel against the corporate debt-E PLURIBUS UNUM- THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: AG 59880464 A (the only non-EIN, found via U.C.C. Filed Documents) [UNITED STATES, INC.](#): it's UNITED STATES: 52-2283179 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: 52-1259974 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: 72-0564834

**Petitioner/appellant
Vs.**

The Corporate Entity's Trading as

The United States Corporation. D&B # 52 – 194379

and its CEO. Donald John Trump

And its subsidiary Corporations

TRADING AS. SUBSIDIARY CORP

The U.S. Federal Bureau of

The U.S. Department of Justice.

The US Department of State

the US Department of the Treasury

And ABA and its affiliates/bar members

The U.S. Department of Homeland Security Inc.

U.S. The office of Secretary of State Inc. offices.

Named appellees at el,

Defendants EIN
numbers see at

[ATT, – 1]

*** This court case # 26 – 1526**

- * Related cases involving the corp.
- * Defendants obstruction of justice in
- * In DC – COA and District Court 95- 2222
- * The court of Federal claims case # 25 –
- * 1398 –MBH COA case's NUMBERS. 25 –
- * 5411 And 25 – 5096 all cases involved
- * forged unsigned orders/mail fraud
- * 28 § 2252 Jury Trial Demanded,
- * Proceedings and every court
- * as well as rules 77, 78, 79, & 81 &
- * FRE Rules 202 (a)(b)(c)(2)(d)(e), th
- * b)(c)(2)(d)(e), FRE.R902, 1002, 201,
- * 1005,1101 (a)(b), 1102, + 1103.
- * As All defendant are subject to **FRCP**
- * the U.S. Federal Bureau of
- * Investigations Inc.
- * **26 (A)** but every court has refused
- * To disclose their corporate
- * For the last 27 years while
- * Treason against the Constitution. *
- As. Published/memorialized U.S.C.A
- * THE published **RULE OF LAW.** And
- * **22 CFR 92.12-92.31** as required

**PETITIONER/APPELLANTS MOTION IN RESPONSE TO THE CORPORATE
PERSONHOOD OF ALLEGED APPELLEES REPRESENTATIVES MAY 17, 2026
DEFICIENT/FRIVOLOUS MOTION PAPER DELIBERATELY MISSTATED FACTS TO
THIS HON. COURT IN VIOLATION OF FRCP RULE 11 ADDRESSING THE COURTS
APRIL 27 MOTION TO SHOW CAUSE BY PUTTING WITH FALSE STATEMENTS,
FALSE COURT RECORDS, UNDER THE CLEAN HANDS DOCTRINE CITED,
CLEARFIELD TRUST CO. V. UNITED STATES, 318 US 363-371.**

Now comes George McDermott hereafter addresses the court as petitioner. In opposition to the motion practice as opposing appellees' erroneous motion of this court and vigorous opposition to the distorted misguided motion paper of alleged defendants' attorney / agent and assigned motion paper of May 17, 2026 asserting evidence supplied as, [ATT – 1-2] As attorneys Paginated reports misstate the facts and evidence before the court as both this corporate court and corporate attorneys

F/N. All courts where dissolved in 2008 under the clearfield doctrine then became registered companies on Dunn and Bradstreet company search. When governments enter the world of commerce, they are subject to the same burdens as any private firm or corporation U.S v Burr 309 U.S 22. See 22, U.S CA 286 e Bank of US v Planters Bank of Georgia 6L Ed (Wheat 244.) NOTE: Under the Clearfield Doctrine, the courts are no longer government entities in that they are demanding private monies and must have a contract with you to compel performance.

have failed to disclose the legal capacity jurisdiction and authority which has been demanded.

Previously demanded under US code title 28 §§ 1603 – 11 petitioner now supplies the court with defendants motion paper of 8 pages of the company by distorting court record [ATT. 2] which appellant will cite from in this response to appellees misstatements. FRE 101 (a)(b)(1,3-4) 201 & 901 (a)(b)(1+7) as the proponent must produce evidence sufficient to support a finding that the item is what the proponent claims it is the proponent /appellant agent must produce evidence sufficient to support a finding that the item is what the proponent claims it is.

1. First and foremost, appellees have never produced after numerous request and all the court cases cited by alleged attorney Daniel Falknor in his motion paper of 05/27/2026. His or his client's legal jurisdiction and authority required under 28 USC §§ 1603 requiring this courts or his client's legal jurisdiction and authority/capacity. Appeared before this court citing to Clearfield doctrine.

Clearfield Doctrine which states All courts where dissolved in 2008 under the Clearfield doctrine then became registered companies on Dunn and Bradstreet company search. When governments enter the world of commerce, they are subject to the same burdens as any private firm or corporation U.S v Burr 309 U.S 22. See 22, U.S CA 286 e Bank of US v Planters Bank of Georgia 6L Ed (Wheat 244.) NOTE: Under the Clearfield Doctrine, the courts are no longer government entities in that they are demanding private monies and must have a contract with you to compel performance. They are no more special as a normal business than your local Jack In The Box. Clearfield Doctrine -“private commercial paper is used by corporate government, then government loses its sovereignty status and becomes no different than a mere private corporation” . Government create and enforce CIVIL LAWS known as statues, acts and legislation created by the Bar Association (set up by Rothschilds) which are duty bound to comply with the LAW of CONTRACTS. The Law of Contracts requires signed written agreements and complete transparency!.

And which now must be addressed for appeals purposes before this court moves forward with the defendant's request for dismissed or summarily affirmed.

2. As this court is fully aware its officer's agent signs and all named defendants and their representatives are paid operatives of the defendant corporation having a direct conflict of interest and have thus far knowingly withheld the legal status as defendant insiders from petitioner. **Governments Have Descended to the Level of Mere Private Corporations** F/N-2.

F/N-2. Governments Have Descended to the Level of Mere Private Corporations Clearfield Doctrine Supreme Court Annotated Statute, Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States 318 U.S. 363- 371 1942 Whereas defined pursuant to Supreme Court Annotated Statute: Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States 318 U.S. 363-371 1942: " What the Clearfield Doctrine is saying is that when private commercial paper is used by corporate government, **8 USC § 1101(a) (21)** The term “national” means a person owing a permanent-allegiance to a state..8 USC § 1101(a) (22)

3. Most surely this court aware of Clearfield Doctrine Supreme Court Annotated Statute, Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States 318 U.S. 363- 371 1942 Whereas defined pursuant to Supreme Court Annotated Statute: Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States 318 U.S. 363-371 1942:

"Governments descend to the level of a mere private corporation, and take on the characteristics of a mere private citizen . . . where private corporate commercial paper [Federal Reserve Notes] and securities [checks] is concerned . . . For purposes of suit, such corporations and individuals are regarded as entities entirely separate from government." What the Clearfield Doctrine is saying is that when private commercial paper is used by corporate government, the courts obligation to comply with corporate affiliation guidelines and statutes required under 28 USC §1603 et seq. before considering relief requested by the appellee's attorneys.

Petitioner

Petitioner Will Now Move Forward Citing Deficiencies In the Appellee's Statement Of Case And Record of The Court to Preserve The Matter For Appeal.

4. Petitioner unfortunately will have to recite for the record each false allegation in unnumbered paragraphs of the appellees statement of case in order to address a properly formatted response and preserve the record for appeal citing the deficiencies in appellees motion paper which the court can take judicial notice of as it has been filed pursuant to FRE 101 (a)(b)(1,3-4) 201 & 901 (a)(b)(1+7).

5. Appellees had stated for the record in unnumbered paragraph page # 1 the following and I quote.

("Mr. McDermitt filed a pro se complaint and United States Ct. of Federal claims purporting to allege breach-of-contract claim. Ex.1 (Compl.). Although the complaint is characterized as asserting a claim for breach of contract, id at 2, the crux to Mr. McDermitt's complaint as collateral attack on the federal court decisions. The complaint alleges that different courts have permitted a breach to continue for 32 years June 2 allege corruption, id at 4 that his property has been encumbered by illegal court judgments since 1995, id at 11, 13 and other federal courts have refused to docket his pleadings. Id at 5 ("[U]nfortunately all the courts dockets have been tampered with and numerous motion papers were never filed along with the vast majority of

other motion papers filed by the petitioner in his lower court, in direct violation of FRCP..."). Mr. McDermitt requested that the trial court issue a writ of mandamus "to compel inferior court officers and agents" to divulge their jurisdiction and authority to engage in ongoing malicious criminal and civil violations court. . . . "Id. At 4 we also request between 30 and \$45 million in damages' at 15, 26.

5.1. Petitioner's response appellees mischaracterization of the above paragraph unnumbered in this pleading stems from his and his client abuse of process the last 32 years plus beginning in 1994 and a bankruptcy proceeding in the matter of Andrew Clifford Moore Greenbelt MD federal court case number 88 – 42746 PM, which is well documented for the appellees agents of the court knowingly was criminal intent brought in a circuit court judge from Prince Georges County Circuit Court not a federal court to sit in on a hearing in which he had no jurisdiction and/or authority and in which the court gifted away \$2 million of petitioner and his partners property to the alleged debtor and their attorney under different pretense of Judge being from the Fifth Circuit Ct. for the US one judge Gerald Schiff. Who had no credentials or authority to appear in a federal court which is well documented in the records of the state and federal courts appellees acknowledged through their filings. Petitioner had paid for a adversary case creating a contract which the with the US court system which required payment of fees in US currency which the government never complied with or provided required on services required under the law of the land. F/N.-3.

5.2. Petitioner was deceived by the crux of the court and the court itself as fictitious corporate entities. Taking undue advantage of an unskilled forced pro se litigant to extort money from petitioner under false pretenses. As a fact NO court has ever divulged their jurisdiction and were authority under title 28 U.S.C. 1603-11. That the court was an artificial person see. Paragraph one

F/N.-3. **Clearfield Doctrine STATES.** All courts where dissolved in 2008 under the clearfield doctrine then became registered companies on Dunn and Bradstreet company search. When governments enter the world of commerce, they are subject to the same burdens as any private firm or corporation U.S v Burr 309 U.S 22. See 22, U.S CA 286 e Bank of US v Planters Bank of Georgia 6L Ed (Wheat 244.) NOTE: Under the Clearfield Doctrine, the courts are no longer government entities in that they are demanding private monies and must have a contract with you to compel performance. They are no more special as a normal business than your local Jack In The Box. Clearfield Doctrine -"private commercial paper is used by corporate government, then government loses its sovereignty status and becomes no different than a mere private corporation". Government create and enforce CIVIL LAWS known as statutes, acts and legislation created by the Bar Association (set up by Rothschilds) which are duty bound to comply with the LAW of CONTRACTS. The Law of Contracts requires signed written agreements and complete transparency! For the past 32 years. Un-fortunately all courts have deceived the petitioner

5.3. Finally appellee's attorney states the record petitioner had sought in 1995 court filings "*Id. At* 4 we also request between 30 and \$45 million in damages' at 15, 26. As was and is petitioner's constitutional rights under article 19 of the Maryland declaration of rights damages estimated at that time. That was before the 32 years of economic and legal terrorism against the petitioner and his family by what petitioner discovered. Was he was dealing with a nongovernment corporate court system formed as defined under the Clearfield doctrine. **Evidencing All courts where dissolved in 2008 under emphasis stated in.**

("U.S v Burr 309 U.S 22. See 22, U.S CA 286 e Bank of US v Planters Bank of Georgia 6L Ed (Wheat 244.)

NOTE: Under the Clearfield Doctrine, the courts are no longer government entities in that they are demanding private monies and must have a contract with you to compel performance. They are no more special as a normal business than your local Jack In The Box. Clearfield Doctrine - "private commercial paper is used by corporate government,") emphasis supplied. It

6. Petitioner moving on to the appellee's attorneys filing of May 27, 2026 [page # 2 P2]. Stacy and I quote. For the record on appeal.

("On December 18, 2025, United States filed a motion to dismiss the complaint pursuant to the rules 12 (b) (1) and 12 (b) (6) of the rules of the United States Ct. of Federal claims (RCFC). Despite being reminded to do so twice by the trial court, Mr. McDermitt did not file a response to the United States' motion Ex 2 at 4. Even though Mr. McDermitt had failed to file a response, the trial court considered the substance of the motion and held that it lacked jurisdiction for five reasons.

This statement is a blatant false statement by appellees attorney in 32 years appellee has never missed a filing in any court as records attest to petitioner has never been sanctioned for bringing bad faith unjustified pleadings before the court. However every court docket beginning in 1994 through present federal and state courts has been tampered with, transcripts of proceedings in which petitioner. Have been tampered with both video and written, and not one court and 32 years has produced a verifiable electronic order, officer's oath of office and allegiance to the Constitution signed by the President of the United States or state officials. In almost 100 court cases and proceedings petitioner has been involved in protecting the rights and liberties of his fellow citizens of citizens who have also lost everything due to unsigned orders court fraud. F/N-4 as F/N-4. The United States Court of Federal Claims anchors its mission in a famous quote by President Abraham Lincoln, who stated: "It is as much the duty of Government to render prompt justice against itself, in favor of citizens, as it is to administer the same, between private individuals." Abraham Lincoln, First Annual Message, 1861

well as the recorded unacceptable malfeasance of office of the defendant corporate agents.

7. It's exciting again from the corporate defendants attorneys paper [page – 2 Par 3]

addressing the first of five reasons restated for the record on appeal,

("First, the trial court held that it lacked jurisdiction because Mr. McDermitt's complaint does not allege any elements necessary for contract formation (offer acceptance, consideration, and authorization consideration, and authorized representative of the United States) and does not identify a still extensive provision of a contract with Mr. McDermitt relies. EX. 2 at 5. I

Appellees representative is has and was made fully aware that the contract was entered into with the defendant officers and agents when petitioner made his first court appearance in the United States Bankruptcy Court Greenbelt Maryland case 88 – 4274 6 PM to alert the court of a fraud taking place against the defendant corporations et al. When filing legal notices with the defendant corporations agents trying to prevent further frauds on the court. What the defendant corporate agents failed to disclose their legal jurisdiction and capacity forcing petitioner to pay US currency into the court system on the promise of equal rights and equal protection under the law which was never received by the court or any of its officers' agents or assigns.

7.1. The court records are replete with hundreds of notices to the courts below as well as this court. Only to be dismissed without any legal process and unsigned orders by judges and court officers joining in the conspiracy to deprive the petitioner and his family members of their equal rights and equal protection under the law FRCP rule. Through a 32-year campaign of obstruction of justice and conspiracy to defraud petitioner and the court employers under color of law and authority to protect. Courts use of the phony County judge appearing as a federal judge who was later known to be affiliated with the Gilbert Saperstein crime syndicate as records attest to,

7.2. Secondly defendants and court insider's agent Daniel D. Falknr who did not list his bar number as required by the court rules in his filing or that of his associates. Stage for the record and once again petitioner will restate for the record to observe the matter for appeal. LC v 5.1. F/N-5.

F/N-5. Attorneys contracting with the court must have a bar number. ("All documents signed by an attorney shall contain the name, address, telephone number, and DC bar identification number of the attorney if the attorney is of the DC bar") noting all attorneys listed on the document. Who are members of the DC bar there DC bar identification numbers regardless of whether they sign the document or not. In this case the bar numbers are listed [ATT – 2 at P-8]. The motion should be stricken for noncompliance.

Again here we have evidence that the defendant corporations agents have a contract with the court and their employers to report criminal misconduct against the courts, opposing parties and their fellow bar members bar rules 3.3 (1) and 8.4 (a)(b)(c)(d) & (f). This is a contract unfulfilled.

8. Petitioner once again citing from alleged attorney Daniel D. Falknor motion paper of 05/27/2026 [page 3 of 8 P 1] attorney references incorrectly. To preserve the record for appeal.

("Second. The trial court determined that "plaintiff's various claims of judicial misconduct against a number of unnamed judicial officers including 'lower court offices and agents 'inferior courts officers and agent as well as the defendant officers and agents.' What in this quote amount to attempts to request a review of previously issued federal court judicia's decisions in a variety of other court pleadings Id at 6. The trial court held that it lacked "jurisdiction over claims that require the court case scrutinized the decisions of federal courts." Id.

Again we have here in the legs to member of the bar of DC constrained by the rules of professional conduct and standard of professional responsibility asserting another false claim knowing that a contract had been consummated by the courts own records docketing petitioner's appeals all emanating from 32 year old chain of judicial abuse in terrorism against the petitioner in his family which is well documented in over thousands of motion papers filed. The primary function of the court is laid out in

FCR rule (1) which states. ("The purpose of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is "to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action and proceeding." Fed. R. Civ. P. 1. The rules were first adopted by order of the Supreme Court on December 20, 1937, transmitted to Congress on January 3, 1938, and effective September 16, 1938. The Civil Rules were last amended in 2025. Reinforced by court judicial canon statute law. "Code of Judicial Conduct for United States Judges." See: JCUS-APR 73, pp. 9-11 which requires compliance with Vol. 2: Ethics and Judicial Conduct Pt. A: Codes of Conduct. Canon 1: 2:, emphasis on Canon 1: A Judge Should Uphold the Integrity and Independence of the Judiciary An independent and honorable judiciary is indispensable to justice in our society. A judge should maintain and enforce high standards of conduct and should personally observe those standards, so that the integrity and independence of the judiciary may be preserved. The provisions of this Code should be construed and applied to further that objective. F/N-6.

8-1. Petitioner asserts that the appellees agent Daniel D. Falknor in his motion paper in [ATT -2] defendant appellee's response to show cause order and exhibits. Sites various cases himself dating back to 1995. Appellees claims of lack of jurisdiction fall under the void order judgment doctrine as

F/N-6 . Government create and enforce CIVIL LAWS known as statues, acts and legislation created by the Bar Association (set up by Rothschilds) which are duty bound to comply with the LAW of CONTRACTS. The Law of Contracts requires signed written agreements and complete transparency! The state, as cited from Supreme Court ruling. **Clearfield Doctrine** All courts where dissolved in 2008 under the Clearfield doctrine then became registered companies on Dunn and Bradstreet company search. When governments enter the world of commerce, all courts failed to declare their jurisdiction and authority under US code title 28 §1603 – 1611 et seq. resulting in this latest lawsuit.

the defendants' alleged agents and assigns. And cou clerks have engaged in a 31 year conspiracy against legal and civil rights by issuing unsigned unverifiable orders. Which the courts of the court refused to produce originals of in wet ink signatures, courts of the court refused to produce the alleged judicial officer's oath of office signed and countersigned by the president of United States as required under US code title 5. U. S. C. §§. 2902 – 06 statute law. All courts including this one and is agents use of unsigned orders are guilty of furthering crimes against the United States of America, and all other named defendant corporations.

8-2. Surely this court and the appellees now seeking a dismissal of this action are aware of the consequences of the void order judgment doctrine. Courts have been given 32 years to produce verified proof of their legal standing and authorization to circumvent statute and rules of this nation's codified and published rule of law in the 50+ volumes printed annually by the GPO. Approved by the Congress and archived in the national archives as the rule of law. With 32 years the conservation unsigned unverifiable orders constituting treason against the Constitution and rule of law all which fall under the. Emphasis supplied and saved for appeals purposes.

applied

The law of void judgments and decisions of our Supreme Court Decisions on Void Orders

A judgment may not be rendered in violation of constitutional protections. The validity of a judgment may be affected by a failure to give the constitutionally required due process notice and an opportunity to be heard. *Earle v. McVeigh*, 91 US 503, 23 L Ed 398. See also Restatements, Judgments ' 4(b). *Prather v Loyd*, 86 Idaho 45, 382 P2d 910. The limitations inherent in the requirements of due process and equal protection of the law extend to judicial as well as political branches of government, so that a judgment may not be rendered in violation of those constitutional limitations and guarantees. *Hanson v Denckla*, 357 US 235, 2 L Ed 2d 1283, 78 S Ct 1228.

8-3. This court is being deceived by the appellee's agent and their boilerplate response to motion to show cause. Littered with false statements, false allegations and untruth. F/N-7

F/N-7. No Opportunity to Be Heard A judgment of a court without hearing the party or giving him an opportunity to be heard is not a judicial determination of his rights. *Sabariego v Maverick*, 124 US 261, 31 L Ed 430, 8 S Ct 461, and is not entitled to respect in any other tribunal. "A void judgment does not create any binding obligation. Federal decisions addressing void state court judgments include *Kalb v. Feuerstein* (1940) 308 US 433, 60 S Ct 343, 84 L ed 370; *Ex parte Rowland* (1882) 104 U.S. 604, 26 L.Ed. 861: "A judgment which is void upon its face, and which re-quires only an inspection of the judgment roll to demonstrate its wants of vitality is a dead limb upon the judicial tree, which should be lopped off, if the power to do so exists." *People v. Greene*, 71 Cal. 100 [16 Pac. 197, 5 Am. St. Rep. 448]. ,? Appellee's motion should be stricken for deceit on the court providing the court with false narratives and false evidence. And attorneys as well as defendants must be forced to divulge their fault corporate identity under the rules as a for-profit corporation governed by the Constitution and rule of law of this nation's. Which the court has withheld from petitioner.

9. Petitioner draws the court's attention third statement appellees representative Daniel D. Falknor has advanced to the court and his motion paper of 05/27/2026 [page 3 unnumbered paragraph 2 which petitioner will recite the record on appeal purposes should it be necessary.

(“Third, to the extent that they complaint alleges a civil rights claim, the trial court held that it “does not have subject matter jurisdiction over actions arising under the civil rights act.” Id .7-8.

9-1. Here again appellees are citing an unsigned unverifiable document/purported order which the lower court clerks offices and judges refused to authenticate and validate as required under the yet the courts routinely entertain thousands of civil rights claims across this nation every month put forth by fictitious corporate insiders and members of the bar which are not dismissed and are allowed to proceed because they are put before the court by name defendants agents and assigns. Being that all the named defendants are now corporate fictions. For the court to recognize in order it must be made available to the court and petitioner in the original form and electronic form. However it can be forensically authenticated., This outlandish statement by corporate insiders must be stricken as an affront on rules of the court and our Constitution emphasis in law.

(“The Clearfield Doctrine arises from a 1943 Supreme Court Case, Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States, 318 US 363-371. "Inasmuch as every government is an artificial person, an abstraction, and a creature of the mind only, a government can interface only with other artificial persons. The imaginary, having neither actuality nor substance, is foreclosed from creating and attaining parity with the tangible. The legal manifestation of this is that no government, as well as any law, agency, aspect, court, etc. can concern itself with anything other than corporate, artificial persons and the contracts between them." S.C.R. 1795, Penhallow v. Doane's Administrators all (3 U.S. 54; 1 L.Ed. 57; 3 Dall. 54)

9-2. Once again everything goes back to the appellees and their agents for compliance with the Constitution and rule of law by fulfilling their obligations to publicly pronounce and record their true corporate identities under US code section 28 U.S.C. F/N-8

F/N-8. December 9th 1945 International Organization Immunities Act relinquished every public office of the United States to the United Nations. 22 CFR 92.12-92.31 FR Heading “Foreign Relationship” states that an oath is required to take office. Title 8 USC 1481 stated once an oath of office is taken citizenship is relinquished, thus you become a foreign entity, agency, or state. That means every public office is a foreign state, including all political subdivisions. (i.e. every single court and that courts personnel is considered a separate foreign entity)1603 -- et seq. **Title 28 USC 3002 Section 15A states that the United States is a Federal Corporation and not a Government**, including the Judiciary Procedural Section.

9-2. Inasmuch as appellees agents the appellees agent **Daniel D. Falknor** along with associate corporate attorneys **BRETT A. SHUMATE ESQ. PATRICIA M MCCARTHY ESQ., TARA K. HOGAN.**

Repeatedly bring up, alleged origin of the lower courts which cannot be authenticated or validated this court must demand that the defendant corporations and their agents provide for discovery and delivered to the court. And to the plaintiff all the alleged orders judgments and decrees they are citing in conformity with **FRCP RULE 78 – 81 & 15 U.S.C. 7001 ET SEQ. THE E SIGN ACT AND INTERNATIONAL DOCUSIGN ENVELOPE ID. THE E SIGN ACT AND INTERNATIONAL DOCUSIGN ENVELOPE ID. (e.g., xxxxxxxx-xxxx-xxxx-xxxx-xxxxxxxxxxxxx) and US code title 18 §1345. In place** them into the public record for purposes of appeal. And also for petitioner to have these unsigned documents forensically validated issued by defendant corporations and their agents. Or face FRCP rule 11 sanctions. For referring to unverifiable document judgments and decrees. F/N-8.

10. Moving forward addressing deficiencies in defendants agents. **Daniel D. Falknor** along with associate corporate attorneys **BRETT A. SHUMATE ESQ. PATRICIA M MCCARTHY ESQ., TARA K. HOGAN.** Motion paper 05/27/2026. Which petitioner no recites for the record on appeal should it be necessary another false statement which must be preserved for the record, and I quote.

Here again defendants agents state (" fourth, to the extent the complaint alleges tort claims, the court held that "the Tucker act specifically excludes tort claims from the jurisdiction of the United States Ct. of Federal claims." Id at.8").

10-1. Here again petitioner incorporates by reference FRCP rule 10 (C). All responses and pages one through 10 of this motion paper to present the record for appeal especially incorporating paragraphs 9 through 9-2. Appellees must produce the wet signature along with electronic signatures and the rules which states that the court cannot entertain tort claims. Which appears to be in conflict with the rules of this court and yet another false statement advanced by appellees agents and assigns.

F/N-9. **28 use 1606. "§ 1606. Extent of liability "As to any claim for relief with respect to which a foreign state is not entitled to immunity under section 1605 or 1607 of this chapter, the foreign state shall be liable in the same manner and to the same extent as a private individual under like circumstances;**

10-2. Here again this court as a rule and statute that is in conflict with the Constitution and rule of law publishing a statute granting the defendants and their agent's immunity for treasonous acts against the Constitution and rule of law granting fellow corporate officers and agents as well as the defendants and their assigns a free get out of jail card for crimes against society, human rights, human liberties and property rights. Under statute Title 28 U.S.C. 1330. Which would force the petitioner to seek permission from the defendants' fellow corporate agents. Which is in direct this court's rules and regulations see

Title 28 USC 3002 Section 15A states that the United States is a Federal Corporation and not a Government, including the Judiciary Procedural Section. The 11th Amendment states "The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of an Foreign State." (A foreign entity, agency, or state cannot bring any suit against a United States citizen without abiding the following procedure.) Citing Title 22 CFR 93.1-93.2 states that the Department of State has to be notified of any suit, and in turn has to notify the UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE: 52-2080384.

10-3. Petitioner as an organic human being not a corporate fiction as the defendants are and have failed to disclose the true identities to this court under US code section **28 U.S.C § 1603.**

Defendant corporations named in the original complaint and officers and agents of this court must now divulge their true corporate affiliation as foreign agents are those they have asserted false counterclaims against the petitioner and the court with false claims of relief as the court fully aware under. Prevailing statutes and laws defendants and their attorneys cannot escape the long arm of the law which states and I quote. For the record on appeal. This court should hold a bifurcated hearing requiring defendants and their agents to divulge their corporate affiliations publicly and on the record. Before continue with any further proceedings. [ATT- 1, 2, 3, 4"], F/N-.10

F/N-.10. **28 U.S.C. § 1606. Extent of liability "As to any claim for relief with respect to which a foreign state is not entitled to immunity under section 1605 or 1607 of this chapter, the foreign state shall be liable in the same manner and to the same extent as a private individual under like circumstances;** but a foreign state except for an agency or instrumentality thereof shall not be liable for punitive damages; if, however, in any case wherein death was caused, the law of the place where the action or omission occurred provides, or has been construed to provide, for damages only punitive in nature, the foreign state shall be liable for actual or compensatory damages measured by the pecuniary injuries resulting from such death which were incurred by the persons for whose benefit the action was brought.

10-4. United States citizen of said suit. As the now federal corporate government is operating as a for-profit entity nongovernment corporate agents along with agents of this court all working for nongovernment for-profit corporations. Awaited. HAVE and All it's fellow for-profit defendant defendants' corporations have waived all judicial immunity according to the published laws of this nation state. It is in conflict with the meaning and intent of the laws passed by our original founding fathers. See as foreign agents.

11. Finally in the matter of jurisdiction of the court appellees agent's **Daniel D. Falknor** along with associate corporate attorneys BRETT A. SHUMATE ESQ. PATRICIA M MCCARTHY ESQ., TARA K. HOGAN. Esq. for the defendant corporations as cited on page 3 P4. The following statement to be preserved for the record on appeal. With the petitioner and not putting the court on notice that on June 4, 2026 plaintiff would be notifying INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE at Peace place 2 2517 KJ The HAGUE Copenhagen Netherlands seeking relief from the injustice and corruption in the United States Ct. system. Which the appellees and their agents are in. Now reciting appellees fifth false jurisdictional question for the record. An appeal should it be necessary.

("Fifth, because the trial court lacked jurisdiction over the complaint the trial court held that the All Writs Act 28 USC § 1651 on was not an independent basis for subject matter jurisdiction. Id at 9. For these reasons to trial court dismissed the complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

11-1. Again we have here, appellees team of attorneys including. **Daniel D. Falknor Esq.** along with associate corporate attorneys BRETT A. SHUMATE ESQ. PATRICIA M MCCARTHY ESQ., TARA K. HOGAN. No bar numbers supplied. Asserting false claims. The court has never produced an original any signed order either wet copy or through electronic transmission which could be authenticated and validate as a minimum standard of care required of all court personnel. So many documents been falsified by the court clerk's office which refuses to produce any verified document request as to the judicial officers capacity of the laws and legal standing, or any verifiable electronic F/N-11.

F/N-.11. "Inasmuch as every government is an artificial person, an abstraction, and a creature of the mind only, a government can interface only with other artificial persons. The imaginary, having neither actuality nor substance, is foreclosed from creating and attaining parity with the tangible. The legal manifestation of this is that no government, as well as any law, agency, aspect, court, etc. can concern itself with anything other than corporate, artificial persons and the contracts between them."

authoritative and frantically authentic records which would stand up under forensic analysis; all orders are unsigned clerk refuses to produce not only in the District Court but in the Court of Appeals the court to federal claims and now in this court approves of the official record alleged attorneys are referring to, all these documents are void under the void order judgment doctrine as a cannot be authenticated or validated. Again citing **FRCP RULE 78 – 81 & 15 U.S.C. 7001 ET SEQ.** THE E SIGN ACT AND INTERNATIONAL DOCUSIGN ENVELOPE ID. THE E SIGN ACT AND A TIME VALUE OF INTERNATIONAL DOCUSIGN ENVELOPE ID. (e.g., xxxxxxxx-xxxx-xxxx-xxxx-xxxxxxxxxxxxxx) and U.S. Code title 18 §1345. Petitioner does not accept the jurisdiction of artificial corporations and/or their artificial agents and assigns denying access to the courts with unsigned unverifiable court orders judgments and decrees.

((“The United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) derives its extraordinary writ power from the All - Writs Act, 28 U.S. Code § 1651 – Writs (a) The Supreme Court and all courts established by Act of Congress may issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of law. (b) An alternative writ or rule nisi may be issued by a justice or judge of a court which has jurisdiction.”))

11-2 . Petitioner finds it strange. That the defendants keep asserting false claims that the court lacked jurisdiction to hear petition for writ of mandamus or writs under 28 U.S. Code § 1651 when both the U. S. Supreme Court and the court. Recognize their duty to issue these rates as appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdiction. Especially in light of the fact that. These challenges come from defendants agents. Appellees agents have not declared legal jurisdiction and or authority, The UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT held a long time ago that The practice of Law CANNOT be licensed by any state/State. This was so stated in a case named *Schwartz v. Board of Examiners*, 353 U.S. 232 (1957). F/N-13

**PETITIONER MUST NOW ADDRESS THE IRREGULARITY AND FALSE STATEMENTS
ADVANCED BY THE APPELLEES AGENTS STARTING FROM THEIR PLEADING OF
March 27, 2026 exhibits stated separately**

F/N-13. FRCP rule 9. (1) *In General*. Except when required to show that the court has jurisdiction, a pleading need not allege: (A) a party's capacity to sue or be sued; (B) a party's authority to sue or be sued in a representative capacity; or C) the legal existence of an organized association of persons that is made a party.

(2) *Raising Those Issues*. To raise any of those issues, a party must do so by a specific denial, which must state any supporting facts that are peculiarly within the party's knowledge. In ("particular has notified every court of appellees misconduct on the record.")

12. Petitioner's response to Danielle D Falknor and his associates/as appellees agents claims restated for the record [P-4 PP1] as appellees had not inserted page numbers as required by the court rules should be forced to do so in order to preserve the record for all courts below have been tampered with by court insiders and cannot be trusted the record of the court of S courthouse security will show order in question before the court was directed at the appellees not at the petitioner. As suggested by attorney. Who have once again propounded false statements in support of their clients and their selves as corporate agents and assigns of the named defendants corporations

No. 13. The order stated that a "failure by Mr. McDermott to respond to this order will result in dismissal for failure to prosecute his appeal." *Id.* Mr. McDermott has filed a motion to correct or supplement and a motion to strike the Court's latest order (that is, the show cause order), but neither of these "motions" constitutes a substantive response to the show-cause order. *See* ECF Nos. 14 & 15.

13. Corporate agents and attorneys who have not properly identified themselves or their client corporate capacity or standing in this case or any other case brought before this court or other courts in the last 32 years that petitioner has requested this verification hundreds of times without knowing that the entity or entities operating as needed defendant corporations or not in fact true government representatives of the peoples of the United States as cited in. Petitioner is a confused about the appellees and their agents legal standing as well as this court's.

1 USC 1: Words denoting number, gender, and so forth the words "person" and "whoever" include corporations, companies, associations, firms, partnerships, societies, and joint stock companies, as well as individuals; "officer" includes any person authorized by law to perform the duties of the office; "signature" or "subscription" includes a mark when the person making the same intended it as such; (a). "oath" includes affirmation, and "sworn" includes affirmed; (2). "writing" includes printing and typewriting and reproductions of visual symbols by photographing, multigraphing, mimeographing, manifolding, or otherwise. (July 30, 1947, ch. 388, 61 Stat. 633 ; June 25, 1948, ch. 645, §6, 62 Stat. 859 ; Oct. 31, 1951, ch. 655, §1, 65 Stat. 710 ; Pub. L. 112-231, §2(a), Dec. 28, 2012, F/N-13

however, petitioner will assert a response to preserve the record for appeal to higher courts.

Which includes the US Supreme Court and possibly the international Court of Justice/human

F/N-13. B – 1. Article violated Article 1 which states that All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood. Respondent state actors discriminate against all unincorporated minorities and disadvantaged individuals being victimized by corporate and white-collar crimes. See supporting evidence.

rights. Commission [@icj-cij.org](https://www.icj-cij.org). Which was also petition on 06/12/2018. By petitioner

15. Petitioner under duress now addresses the paragraphs numbered submitted by appellees agent as arguments beginning on ("page 4 paragraph") objecting to the appellees agent Daniel Falknor and his team's unprofessionalism and petitioner will recite each of the arguments to preserve the record for appeal.

Argument number [1]. The court should summarily affirm the judgment of the Court of Federal claims because the trial court correctly dismissed Mr. McDermott's complaint for lack of jurisdiction and there is no substantial question regarding the outcome of the appeal Joshua V. United States, citation on original.

Again, this attorney is stating statements that are not in the record and consistent with the court rules as cited in the paragraphs. 1-9 above all quarter judgments and decrees avoid under the void order judgment doctrine as they are unsigned and on verifiable in the course of the court refused to produce any originals as required by law. In statute. As well as the court dockets have been tampered with making them void also as incomplete record requiring a new proceeding.

Argument # [2]' attorney states and I quote ("the Court of Federal claims is a limited subject matter jurisdiction whose authority to certain actions against the United States is determined by the extent of what she United States has waived its sovereign immunity Brown v. U.S. citation's omitted, citing the Tucker act, the principal statute governing the court's jurisdiction waiver of the United States sovereign immunity for the monetary claims not sounding in tort that are founded upon the United States Constitution, a federal statute or regulation, a federal statute or regulation, or express implied contract of the United States. 28 U.S.C. §1491 (a) (1). Although the Tucker act and iambuses' the Court of Federal claims with jurisdiction to entertain these categories of claims it does not create an substantive right to enforce against the United States for money damages." United States v. Testan again citation on original appellees filing.

Petitioner. Challenges attorneys' statements again citing the fact that no court since 1994 in the federal court system has produced an oath of office of any judge, and verified signature F/N-14. of any judge, and authenticated electronic communication from any court clerk. See paragraphs 1-

F/N-14. Webster's legal definition of **iambuses' legal definition of judicial misconduct**. Is any conduct by a judge that violates ethical guidelines or legal standards. It encompasses actions demonstrating bias, partiality, conflicts of interest, or failure to perform duties diligently. Misconduct is separate from a "legal error" (a mistake in applying the law), which can only be overturned by an appellate court. [1, 2, 3, 4] Federal and state judicial systems handle misconduct through established ethical codes and commission.

Continuing with attorney Daniel Falknor's unnumbered paragraph from page 4. Attorney further states according to the Court of Federal claims to poses jurisdiction to certain plaintiff's claims, the plaintiffs "must identify a separate source of substantive law that creates the right to money damages" Fisher v. United States citation again on appellees original. "In parlance" of the Tucker act cases, that source must be "money-mandating" source is "fatal to the court's jurisdiction under the Tucker act." Id at 1173.

Petitioner's response is outlined in paragraphs 1 through 12 listed above which the court can take judicial notice of. Once again how can a officer of the court site court records that cannot be verified authenticated or validated where the appellees have stated many cases dating back to 1998 in this response. And each court case involves the same thing dismissal without any hearings, dismissal without emotions or responses from the defendant corporations or the dozens upon dozens of agents who have been reported to their superiors for misconduct of office and accessories to and after the fact in denying petitioner and tens of thousands of other pro se litigants of our rights without due process of the law with the same unsigned void/no documents which even as of the day is filing court clerks refused to authenticate or validate as required by law plaintiff now recites from the at the bottom of page 5 of appellees motion paper.

Which states and I quote for the record on appeal. ("The plaintiff bears the burden of proving that the court has jurisdiction to entertain their claims. Trusted integrations, Inc. v. United States, citation on appellees filing with this court. Although pro se pleadings are "held to a list stringent standard than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers" and are to be liberally construed," Erikson v Pardus, citing original. Appellees are citing a alleged per curiam unsigned order amended citations all the leniency to be accorded to such please does not relieve the pro se plaintiff of their obligations to establish Jurisdictional requirements. Riles v. United States. And other citations omitted. ("[A] court may not summarily take a liberal view of . . . Jurisdictional requirement[s]. To entertain claims advanced in their complaints. El Malik v. United States. Again, citation omitted in appellees original. Continuing to page 6..? F/N-15.

Appellees have through the pleading clearly stated that court may not summarily take liberal view of jurisdiction and or authority of its rules of professional conduct standard of professional responsibility. Which is taking place for the last 32 years. And certainly, cannot take

F/N-15. No Opportunity to Be Heard A judgment of a court without hearing the party or giving him an opportunity to be heard is not a judicial determination of his rights. Sabariego v Maverick, 124 US 261, 31 L Ed 430, 8 S Ct 461, and is not entitled to respect in any other tribunal. "A void judgment does not create any binding obligation. Federal decisions addressing void state court judgments include Kalb v. Feuerstein (1940) 308 US 433, 60 S Ct 343, 84 L ed 370; Ex parte Rowland (1882) 104 U.S. 604, 26 L.Ed. 861: "A judgment which is void upon its face, and which re-quires only an inspection of the iudgment roll to demonstrate its wants of vitality is a dead limb upon the iudicial tree...?

on verifiable evidence into the record as a appellees would suggest the court is never produced any valid signature to support any of the appellees claims it would be irresponsible for this court not to adhere to its legal principle and demand appellees the court clerks officers with agents and the alleged judicial officers issuing these unsigned orders to produce their electronic verification documents required under certainly the court can realize that every statement and every motion appellees referred to the United States. And not as the true defendants United States Inc. their employers who have waived their sovereign immunity as foreign agents. Court can take judicial notice of paragraphs 1 through 11 that notice was given and never respond to under the Clearfield doctrine petitioner has furnished the EIN numbers of these corporate entities. Which at this point have no legal representation in this court through the latest filings of the attorneys Daniel Fulknor Esq. alleged representative of the defendant corporation. [ATT. – 1].

Here again petitioner must refer to the appellees unnumbered paragraphs on page 6 all of his motion paper which she states the record and I quote.

(“Here, the court of Federal claims correctly identified five reasons why Mr. McDermott did not meet the burden to establish that the court possessed jurisdiction to entertain the purported breach of contract claim”)

Here again we have the alleged defendants corporate attorney Daniel Fulknor his associates and supervisors submitting false documents to the court and false claims into the court record. Defendant corporations and their agents cannot refute that the petitioner has sought their legal jurisdiction and authority for the last 30 years through correspondence motion papers public information request freedom of information request and personally hand delivering hundreds of applications to the house and Senate Judiciary Committee the corporate executive, as a named defendant and all its Board of Directors in the house of Senate and the cabinet officers of the states. Which have been furnished to this court, and can be verified to the courthouse security system which the courthouse and clerk’s office refused to produce copies of the videos which prove filings that were never put on the court record, the clerk of the court intimidation of petitioner by making him alter documents before they could be accepted to the court in noncompliance with FRCP 179 and 81,

This court should compel through writ of mandamus and writ of prohibition to the clerk’s offices and court supervisors offices to furnish the legal standing as corporate officers and agents

of the United States of America Inc. as listed and assigned number under Dun & Bradstreet's listing the security obligations of the alleged corporate entities without which this court cannot make a true determination and must deny all relief requested by appellees agents especially in light of the fact that attorneys for the government corporations have a conflict of interest is a also purportedly represent the American Bar Association Inc. who has never entered an appearance and subject to a summary judgment in each and every case cited by appellees in the following paragraphs. [ATT 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6] which includes all of appellees filings and court correspondence which have been tampered with.

Plaintiff moves on answer the unnumbered paragraph on page 6 paragraph 1. State and Irish state for the record for appeal,

("first, the trial court determined that the complaint does not allege any of the essential elements of the government contract (i.e., offer, acceptance, consideration, the federal employee with authority to bind the government), Ex2at 5n the trial court correctly held that it lacked jurisdiction over any contract claim because Mr. McDermott failed to allege any of the elements of the contract. See J v. United States citation on appellees filing. Because appellant has not alleged the elements of a contract with the United States, her claim is not within the jurisdiction of the Court of Federal claims."): Gibson v. United States. Again, citations in the custody of the appellees and the court omitted in appellees filing. ("Because[appellant] has not alleged the elements of a contract").

Petitioner's response is that every court docket has been tampered with, every court transcript has been tampered with, every court order judgment and or decree has been deliberately falsified and the courts have failed to produce originals of any of these orders judgment and or decrees or their electronic verifying counterparts required under 2000 E sign act and paper reduction act as required by law emphasis supplied. **FRCP RULE 78 – 81 & 15 U.S.C. 7001 ET SEQ. THE E SIGN ACT AND INTERNATIONAL DOCUSIGN ENVELOPE ID. THE E SIGN ACT AND INTERNATIONAL DOCUSIGN ENVELOPE ID. (e.g., xxxxxxxx-xxxx-xxxx-xxxx-xxxxxxxxxxxxxx) and US code title 18 §1345.. The defendant has the burden of proof of producing the documents therefore their claims must be denied and this appeal allowed to move forward. Under the**

federal rules of evidence petitioner incorporates all motions pleadings asserted in paragraph

one through page 18 of this pleading under FRCP rule 10 (C). To preserve the record for appeal

in conclusion. Alleged appellees made it clear throughout all pleadings that they represent the line United States as they have referred to it in all of the pleadings, this matter was brought against the United States of America government of we the people of the United States of America. As identified by their-"E PIURIBUS unum. It is not no more than a shadow government run by corporate executives disrespecting the rule of law under. Various aliases .working as shadow governments of the organic alien George is the Mr. phone call from him a call back when you get a chance hope it's nothing serious I love you by THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: AG 59880464 A (the only non-EIN, found via U.C.C. Filed Documents), [UNITED STATES, INC.](#): it's aliases UNITED STATES: 52-2283179. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: 52-1259974, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: 72-0564834, hello, [WHITE HOUSE](#): 52-1413575, WHITE HOUSE ART GALLERY: 52-0799067 [HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES US](#): 23-7358951, [HOUSE DC INC](#): 30-0117990 (This is the House of Representatives for the DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MUNICIPAL CORPORATION), holding [SENATE UNITED STATES](#): 52-108580, [UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT COURTS US](#): 52-2283179, UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT COURTS US: 23-7420574 [DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE](#): 53-0205205, THE [UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY](#) 1789: 54-9139651 The : 54-9139651.

Not one of these defendants' corporations. Corporate capacity or through their attorney. One of these entities had produced demand for corporate affiliations statements under 28 USC 1603. Not one of these corporate entities have investigated fraud on the court falsification court records falsification court dockets and destruction of court papers after thousands of reports. For the appellees to claim otherwise is an absolute falsehood they should be sanctioned under FRCP rules 11.

Different demands a bifurcated hearing and "on the record at which time defendant corporation must produce legal standing the compliance with the rules and regulations of this court and copies of all sign orders judgment decrees and electronic communications which they are illegally withholding.

Relief requested. The court look into why the Perkins report has not responded to the motion papers and for your request regarding petitioner's hopefully being clean accused of violating the court rules and not being allowed to access the clerk's office even with a security officer/US Marshall escort court still will not produce the video of courthouse security supporting the allege planes against petitioner.

Respectfully submitted

George Edward McDermott, all rights reserved. You UCC- 101, 102, 306 - 308 and US code title 15 US code

title 15 7001 ET SEQ. THE E SIGN ACT AS WELL as **FRCP RULE 78 - 81 & 15 U.S.C. and 28 USC 3006.**

Certificate of service petitioner on this ninth day of June 2026 will be emailing a copy of this motion paper to the offices of defendant's counsel, Daniel D Falknor as lead counsel for all defendants@Daniel.D.Falknor@US DOJ.gov in accordance with the rules of this court with additional copies to the US Court of Appeals and District Court who have refused to produce any valid signed orders judgments or decrees for 32 years. By ____

I am awaiting court on how easily it is lovely that we believe I tried and tried to find its universal April wilderness that little wall there in the bathroom is behind there I found it leaking outside a little but sneaky awareness because it first you don't know anything is a little water on the floor like a toilet leaking note I checked every cell liking him take care etc. I believe Laura Stein but it's now my responsibility so I am willing to give you a few hundred dollars to go down like TL and 10 if you want to spend the night because of the easy way to get on with your death your don't know what you might need in a very tight space you need somebody that I have to I know this guy get this thing

	Petitioner's response to appellees deficient answer to motion to show cause with attachments		
ATT – 1	Description of document in support of motion paper	Date	Page #
ATT – 2	Verified list of offending corporations ISN numbers. As affirmative proof corporations are named defendants	05/27/2026	Pages 20-21
ATT – 3	Defendant corporations motion paper regarding motion to show cause	05/27/2026	Pages 22-29
ATT – 4	Petitioner's June 4 motion paper US Court of Appeals date stamped copy of cover page filed regarding a unsigned orders	06/04/2026	Page 30
ATT – 5	37 pages of appellees attachments clearly showing that false statements have been made court dockets have been tampered with judicial orders are unsigned and fraud on the court is taking place. To preserve the record for appeal	05/27/2026	Pages 1 to 37 separately attached

EINs for the United States, Inc and Child Corporations Governmental EINs: Amazingly, we find that the "United States" has incorporated multiple times, that the Whitehouse, House of Representatives, Congress, and Judiciary are all separate CORPORATIONS with their own EINs, **and that the Treasury from 1789 is not the same as the current Treasury.**

Dun & Bradstreet Corporate Listing: ["Government of The United States DBA US Government"](#) (they can't DBA unless they ARE a corporation)

-E PLURIBUS UNUM- THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: AG 59880464 A (the only non-EIN, found via U.C.C. Filed Documents)

[UNITED STATES, INC.](#): it's

UNITED STATES: 52-2283179

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: 52-1259974

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: 72-0564834

[WHITE HOUSE](#): 52-1413575

WHITE HOUSE ART GALLERY: 52-0799067

[HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES US](#): 23-7358951

[HOUSE DC INC](#): 30-0117990 (This is the House of Representatives for the DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MUNICIPAL CORPORATION)

[SENATE UNITED STATES](#): 52-1085802

[UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT COURTS US](#): 52-2283179

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT COURTS US: 23-7420574

[DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE](#): 53-0205205

THE [UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY](#) 1789: 54-9139651

The [INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY](#): 54-9139651

(The IRS DoT is different than the US DoT. These Departments are within a different organizations, and are deceptively named the same. When you file taxes, do you send taxes to the US Treasury or the IRS Treasury? Because the IRS is a foreign corporation only allowed to levy taxes upon non-American National ARTIFICIAL PERSONS according to the Second INCORPORATED CONSTITUTION **OF[not "for"]** THE UNITED STATES.)

[NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH](#): 52-2102558

[UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ARMY](#): 56-2634924

[UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF NAVY](#): 54-6140537

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF NAVY: 54-1717223

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF NAVY: 52-1767199

[UNITED STATES SPACE FOUNDATION](#): 31-1653556

[UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE](#): 53-0056498

[UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE](#): 52-2080384

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE: 53-0196642

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE: 52-1313593

[UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY](#): 05-1332630

[UNITED STATES COAST GUARD](#): 23-7420063

[UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE](#): 52-2200788

[DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE](#): 65-0200168

[FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION](#): 53-6009326

[GENERAL SERVICE ADMINISTRATORS\[, INC.\]](#): 59-3686238

[INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE](#): 52-6037440

[SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION](#): 26-2750394

[FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION](#): 91-2021627

[FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION](#): 52-1582182

[CENTER FOR DISEASE CONTROL](#): 04-3797580

[UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE](#): 52-1503251

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE: 52-0886646

[UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE](#): 52-1535613

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, INC. AKA [UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES](#): 04-2527432

Only Kentucky, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Northern Mariana Islands, and Puerto Rico are actual

Commonwealths in the United States, Inc.

For the record on appeal not one of the above corporate entities that are agent and or assigns including the defendant corporate attorneys **BRETT A. SHUMATE ESQ.** **PATRICIA M MCCARTHY ESQ., TARA K. HOGAN** or their purported author of alleged Defendants Response to Show Cause Order May 27 2026 filed by trial attorney work **DANIEL D FALLKNOR ESQ.** ...? Being agents of the defendant corporations. All having identified themselves as corporate fictions through the capitalizations of their name and their affiliation with the defendants named in the complaint are required to divulge their corporate affiliation and contracts. With the parent corporations under 28 USC §§ 1603 et seq. which as of the date of this filing no such corporate affiliation statements have been filed with this court, or any of the courts involving the defendant corporations and or their strawmen which defendant agents listed above are. And must declare their jurisdiction and authority,

In personam, literally translating to “against the person,” refers to courts' power to [adjudicate](#) matters directed against a party. In personam jurisdiction is one of the two forms of [personal jurisdiction](#) with the other being [in-rem](#) jurisdiction

[A juridical person is a legal person that is not a natural person but an organization recognized by law as a fictitious person such as a corporation, government agency, non-governmental organization, or international organization. Other terms include artificial person, corporate person, judicial](#)

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

GEORGE MCDERMOTT,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

THE UNITED STATES,
Defendant-Appellee.

No. 26-1526

**DEFENDANT-APPELLEE'S RESPONSE TO SHOW CAUSE ORDER
AND EXHIBITS**

Pursuant to the Court's order dated April 27, 2026 (ECF No. 13), defendant, the United States, respectfully submits this response to the Court's order requiring the parties to show cause why this appeal should not be dismissed or summarily affirmed. For the reasons stated below, the appeal should be dismissed or summarily affirmed.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Mr. McDermott filed a *pro se* complaint in the United States Court of Federal Claims purporting to allege a breach-of-contract claim. Ex. 1¹ (Compl.). Although the complaint is characterized as asserting a claim for breach of contract, *id.* at 2, the crux of Mr. McDermott's complaint is a collateral attack on other Federal court decisions. The complaint alleges that different courts have permitted a breach to

¹ Consistent with Federal Circuit Rule 27(d), this filing includes a table of contents identifying two exhibits, both of which are paginated and separately tabbed for ease of reference.

continue for 32 years due to alleged corruption, *id.* at 4, that his property has been encumbered by illegal court judgments since 1995, *id.* at 11, 13, and that other Federal courts have refused to docket his pleadings. *Id.* at 5 (“[U]nfortunately 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....”). Mr. McDermott requested that the trial court issue a writ of mandamus “to compel inferior court officers and agents” to “divulge their jurisdiction and authority to engage in the ongoing malicious criminal/civil violations” *Id.* at 4. He also requested between \$30 and \$45 million in damages. *Id.* at 15, 26.

On December 18, 2025, the United States filed a motion to dismiss the complaint pursuant to Rules 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6) of the Rules of the United States Court of Federal Claims (RCFC). Despite being reminded to do so twice by the trial court, Mr. McDermott did not file a response to the United States’ motion. Ex. 2 at 4. Even though Mr. McDermott had failed to file a response, the trial court considered the substance of the motion and held that it lacked jurisdiction for five reasons.

First, the trial court held that it lacked jurisdiction because Mr. McDermott’s complaint does not allege any of the elements necessary for contract formation (offer acceptance, consideration, and an authorized representative of the United States) and

does not identify the substantive provisions of the contract on which Mr. McDermott relies. Ex. 2 at 5.

Second, the trial court determined that “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.” *Id.* at 6. The trial court held that it lacked “jurisdiction over claims that require the court to scrutinize the decisions of federal courts.” *Id.*

Third, to the extent the complaint alleged a Civil Rights claim, the trial court held that it “does not have subject matter jurisdiction over actions arising under the Civil Rights Acts.” *Id.* at 7-8.

Fourth, to the extent the complaint alleged tort claims, the trial court held that “the Tucker Act specifically excludes tort claims from the jurisdiction of the United States Court of Federal Claims.” *Id.* at 8.

Fifth, because the trial court lacked jurisdiction over the complaint, the trial court held that the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651, was not an independent basis for subject matter jurisdiction. *Id.* at 9. For these reasons, the trial court dismissed the complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

This appeal followed. On April 27, 2026, the Court ordered the parties “to show cause why this appeal should not be dismissed or summarily affirmed.” ECF

No. 13. The order stated that a “failure by Mr. McDermott to respond to this order will result in dismissal for failure to prosecute his appeal.” *Id.* Mr. McDermott has filed a motion to correct or supplement and a motion to strike the Court’s latest order (that is, the show cause order), but neither of these “motions” constitutes a substantive response to the show-cause order. *See* ECF Nos. 14 & 15.

ARGUMENT

The Court should summarily affirm the judgment of the Court of Federal Claims because the trial court correctly dismissed Mr. McDermott’s complaint for lack of jurisdiction, and there is “no substantial question regarding the outcome” of the appeal. *Joshua v. United States*, 17 F.3d 378, 380 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

The Court of Federal Claims is a court of limited subject-matter jurisdiction whose authority to entertain actions against the United States is determined by the extent to which the United States has waived its sovereign immunity. *Brown v. United States*, 105 F.3d 621, 623 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *United States v. Sherwood*, 312 U.S. 583, 586 (1941). The Tucker Act, the principal statute governing the court’s jurisdiction, waives the United States’ sovereign immunity for monetary claims not sounding in tort that are founded upon the United States Constitution, a Federal statute or regulation, or an express or implied contract with the United States. 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1). Although the Tucker Act imbues the Court of Federal Claims with jurisdiction to entertain these categories of claims, it “does not create any substantive right enforceable against the United States for money damages.” *United States v.*

Testan, 424 U.S. 392, 398 (1976). Accordingly, for the Court of Federal Claims to possess jurisdiction to entertain a plaintiff's claims, the plaintiff "must identify a separate source of substantive law that creates the right to money damages." *Fisher v. United States*, 402 F.3d 1167, 1172 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc). "In the parlance of Tucker Act cases, that source must be 'money-mandating.'" *Id.* at 1172. The absence of such a money-mandating source is "fatal to the court's jurisdiction under the Tucker Act." *Id.* at 1173.

The plaintiff bears the burden of proving that the court has jurisdiction to entertain their claims. *Trusted Integration, Inc. v. United States*, 659 F.3d 1159, 1163 (Fed. Cir. 2011). Although *pro se* pleadings are "held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers" and are to be "liberally construed," *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (per curiam) (citation omitted), the leniency to be accorded such pleadings does not relieve the *pro se* plaintiff of their obligation to establish jurisdictional requirements. *Riles v. United States*, 93 Fed. Cl. 163, 165 (2010); see *Kelley v. Sec'y of the U.S. Dep't of Labor*, 812 F.2d 1378, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 1987) ("[A] court may not similarly take a liberal view of . . . jurisdictional requirement[s] and set a different rule for *pro se* litigants only."). Thus, the *pro se* plaintiff, like any plaintiff, bears the burden of proving that the court possesses jurisdiction to entertain the claims advanced in their complaint. *El Malik v. United States*, 170 Fed. Cl. 590, 594 (2024).

Here, the Court of Federal Claims correctly identified five reasons why Mr. McDermott did not meet his burden to establish that the court possessed jurisdiction to entertain his purported breach-of-contract claim.

First, the trial court determined that the complaint does not allege any of the essential elements of a Government contract (*i.e.*, offer, acceptance, consideration, and a Federal employee with authority to bind the Government). Ex. 2 at 5. The trial court correctly held that it lacked jurisdiction over any contract claim because Mr. McDermott failed to allege any of the elements of a contract. *See Joye v. United States*, 781 F. App'x 994, 997 (Fed. Cir. 2019) ("Because [appellant] has not alleged the elements of a contract with the United States, her claim is not within the jurisdiction of the Court of Federal Claims."); *Gibson v. United States*, 55 F. App'x 938, 939 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (same); *Greene v. United States*, No. 2023-1613, 2023 WL 5163335, at *2 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 11, 2023) (affirming dismissal for lack of jurisdiction where appellant "failed to plead the existence of a contract").

Second, this Court's precedent instructs that the Court of Federal Claims does not possess jurisdiction to review the decisions of other courts or the proceedings before those courts. *Joshua*, 17 F.3d at 380 (holding that "the Court of Federal Claims does not have jurisdiction to review the decisions of district courts or the clerks of district courts relating to proceedings before those courts"). The trial court reviewed the complaint and found that "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.” Ex. 2 at 6. The trial court properly held that it lacked jurisdiction to review collateral attacks on the decisions of other Federal courts. *See Joshua*, 17 F.3d at 380.

Third, to the extent the complaint asserted a Civil Rights claim, the trial court correctly held that the Court of Federal Claims lacks jurisdiction over Civil Rights claims. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1343; *see also Evans v. United States*, 249 F. App’x 201, 203 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (“To whatever extent Evans may be asserting claims under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, the Court of Federal Claims similarly would not have jurisdiction over them.”) *Taylor v. United States*, 310 Fed. App’x. 390, 393 (Fed. Cir. 2009) (same).

Fourth, to the extent the complaint asserted a tort claim, the trial court correctly held that the Court of Federal Claims lacks jurisdiction over tort claims. *See* 28 U.S.C. §1491(a); *see also 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).

Finally, the trial court correctly held that because it lacks jurisdiction over the complaint, and because the All Writs Act is not an independent basis for jurisdiction, the trial court lacked jurisdiction to award the mandamus relief sought in the complaint pursuant to the All Writs Act. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) (stating that courts established by an act of Congress may issue writs necessary “in aid of their respective

jurisdictions”); *Baker Perkins, Inc. v. Werner & Pfleiderer Corp.*, 710 F.2d 1561, 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (“The All Writs Act is not an independent basis of jurisdiction . . .”).

In sum, the Court of Federal Claims correctly dismissed Mr. McDermott’s complaint for lack of jurisdiction. Because there is no substantial question regarding the outcome of this appeal, summary disposition is appropriate.

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, the United States respectfully requests that the Court affirm the judgment of the Court of Federal Claims.

Respectfully submitted,

BRETT A. SHUMATE
Assistant Attorney General

PATRICIA M. MCCARTHY
Director

TARA K. HOGAN
Assistant Director

/s/ Daniel D. Falknor
DANIEL D. FALKNOR
Trial Attorney
Commercial Litigation Branch
Civil Division
U.S. Department of Justice
P.O. Box 480
Ben Franklin Station
Washington, D.C. 20044
(202) 616-0320
Daniel.D.Falknor@usdoj.gov

May 27, 2026

Attorneys for Defendant-Appellee

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

JUN - 4 2026

IN THE CORPORATE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

RECEIVED

George Edward McDermott Sr.'s
MD 20745 (301) 996- 9577
Email @ georgemcdermott2018@gmail.com
proceeding under. 28 USC 1654 statute law.
28 U.S.C. 1603 – 11. & FRCP Rule 3. Plaintiff/
Vs.

The Corporate Entity's Trading as
The United States Corporation. D&B # 52 – 194379
and its CEO. Donald John Trump
And its subsidiary Corporations
TRADING AS. SUBSIDIARY CORP
Rule the U.S. Federal Bureau of
The U.S. Department of Justice.
The US Department of State
the US Department of the Treasury
And ABA and its affiliates/bar members
The U.S. Department of Homeland Security Inc.

Defendants EIN
numbers see at
[ATT, – 1]

U.S. The office of Secretary of State Inc. offices.
Named appellees at Ei,

This court's case NUMBERS. 25 – 5411
* And related case25 – 5096
* As well as The court of Federal claims
* case #25 – 1398 –MBH
* 28 § 2252 Jury Trial Demanded
*
* as well as rules 77, 78, 79, & 81 &
* FRE Rules 202 (a)(b)(c)(2)(d)(e),
* b)(c)(2)(d)(e), FRE.R902, 1002, 201,
* 1005,1101 (a)(b), 1102, + 1103.
* As All defendant are subject to FRCP
* Rule the U.S. Federal Bureau of
* Investigations Inc.
* 26 (A) but every court has refused
* To disclose their corporate
* For the last 27 years while
* Treason against the Constitution. *
As. Published/memorialized U.S.C.A
* THE published **RULE OF LAW**. And
* 22 CFR 92.12-92.31 as required

APPELLANT'S GEORGE MOTION TO THIS COURT'S TO STRIKE IN VACATE FORGED UNSIGNED COURT'S
NONCOMPLIANT CT. ORDER'S OF MAY 21, & 29. MORNING 2026 WHICH RECEIVED BY USPS MAIL UNDER
MAIL FRAUD STATUTES BY ALLEGED COURT OFFICERS. CLIFTON B. 'S CISLAK AND DANIEL J. REIDY'S.
IMPLICATING THE FOLLOWING JUDGES OF THIS COURT, JUDGES SRINIVAASAN, (CHIEF JUDGE). AND
HENDERSON, MILLETT WILKINS, PILLARD, RAO, WALKER, CHILDS8, PAN AND GARCIA THE FURTHERANCE
OF TREASON AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION AND FRAUD ON THE COURT THROUGH THE USE OF YET
ANOTHER UNSIGNED UNVERIFIABLE ORDER. FRCP RULE 78 – 81 & 15 U.S.C. 7001 ET SEQ. THE E SIGN ACT
AND INTERNATIONAL DOCUSIGN ENVELOPE ID. THE E SIGN ACT AND INTERNATIONAL DOCUSIGN
ENVELOPE ID. (e.g., XXXXXXXX-XXXX-XXXX-XXXX-XXXXXXXXXXXX) and US code title 18 §1345.

Now comes George McDermott hereafter appellant through the motion practice of this
court filing a motion to strike in vacate the latest to nonconforming orders of this court of May 21
& 29th 2026 [ATT – 1-2] due to malicious/criminal nonconformity with the court rules and as an
exercise in judicial and legal terrorism against the appellant. Which had been reported to the court
superiors as defined under mail fraud statutes. 18 U.S.C, § 1345. (A)(1)(A)(b)(3)(b) F/N-1.

F/N-1. 18 U.S.C. §1345. Injunctions against fraud (a)(1) If a person is— (A) violating or about to violate this
chapter or section 287, 371 (insofar as such violation involves a conspiracy to defraud the United States or any
agency thereof), or 1001 of this title; §1345. Injunctions against fraud (a)(1) If a person is—(A) violating or
about to violate this chapter or section 287, 371 (insofar as such violation involves a conspiracy to defraud the
United States or any agency thereof), or 1001 of this title:

Page 1