IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

ROBERT WYN YOUNG,	)	**Case No. 1:26-cv-02727**
Plaintiff	)	**Judge David A. Ruiz**
v.	)	
TRUMP, et al.,	)	
Defendants.	)	

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO REMAND

I. BACKGROUND

On September 9, 2026, pursuant to and in accordance with the terms of 18 U.S.C. § 2382, the undersigned Reporting Attorney proffered submission of a full, paper/hard copy and electronic version (i.e., USB flash drive) of the undersigned Reporting Attorney's federally~mandated Misprision Report Package to Judge Brent N. Robinson, a judge of the State of Ohio of the undersigned's choosing; but, by verbal Order, Judge Robinson rejected submission of the undersigned's Misprision Report Package pursuant to the terms of federal law and, instead, he Ordered (again, verbally, and through his Bailiff) that same be submitted electronically, in accordance and upon compliance with unidentified Ohio and/or Local rule(s) requiring the payment of filing fee(s), random assignment of judge, etc.

On September 11, 2026, and under objection, the undersigned electronically filed the undersigned's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States (and all attachments to same, together comprising the Misprision Report Package) with the Richland County Common Pleas Court **subject to** the requirements of (1) a filing fee, (2) the completion and filing of a Richland County form Civil

Case Designation Sheet (copy attached as Exhibit 1), and (3) the random assignment of a reviewing/presiding judge. The undersigned respectfully submits that such state/local requirements/preconditions for the submission and filing of the undersigned's federally~mandated report of treason against the United States were and are **unlawful** under the Supremacy Clause, and they arguably removed the undersigned's report from the protective auspices of 18 U.S.C. § 2382, at least for purposes of submission. For this reason, the undersigned Reporting Attorney became duty~bound to prepare and also file on September 11, 2026, a Praecipe for Service on Interested Persons and Organizations (copy attached as Exhibit 2) stating, in pertinent part:

> Please issue **Certified Mail** service, as directed below, of a paper/hard copy of the undersigned Reporting Attorney's 161~page **Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States** ["Misprision Report (written)"] (double~sided printing acceptable), together with **Notice** of the undersigned Reporting Attorney's **electronic** submission/filing in the above~captioned matter of 125 total documents/files, including the Misprision Report (written), as part of the undersigned Reporting Attorney's **Misprision Report Package**.

The undersigned Reporting Attorney did **not** request or authorize the issuance or service of **summonses** to the persons identified as likely co~conspirators in the report/as Interested Persons and Organizations in the Praecipe. Further, in completing the Civil Case Designation Sheet, the undersigned was (unlawfully) required to list self as "Plaintiff"; but the undersigned listed "(NONE)" for Defendant(s), identified the Type of Action as a "MISPRISION REPORT", electronically signed the form as "Robert Wyn Young, Pro Se Reporting Atty", and took the further clarifying step of typing the following in the Complex Litigation designation section: "IN RE ROBERT WYN YOUNG, MISC. ACTION UNDER 18 U.S.C. SEC. 2382 TO MAKE REPORT OF TREASON". The undersigned Reporting Attorney is **not** a Plaintiff and is not turned into one by the Civil Case Designation Sheet; **nor** is the **nature of** or **jurisdiction for** the undersigned's

18 U.S.C. § 2382 report of treason changed or negated in any way by the imposition of a filing fee, the required completion of the Civil Case Designation Sheet, or by the random assignment of a judge (since the report ended up being randomly assigned to the state court judge of the undersigned's choosing in any event). Further, in the undersigned's 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report, there are **no Defendants**, **nor** any parties against whom any claim is asserted or any order is sought; rather, the undersigned's 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report identifies certain persons and organizations as a likely co~conspirators in the Sandy Hook **treasonous** conspiracy, and the undersigned requested issuance of **notice** to such persons and organizations, by the Richland County Clerk, pursuant to the undersigned's Praecipe for Service on Interested Persons and Organizations.

Why did the undersigned Reporting Attorney become duty~bound to prepare and also file on September 11, 2026, a Praecipe for Service on Interested Persons and Organizations to be sent to all persons and organizations the undersigned was duty~bound to identify as likely co~conspirators in the Sandy Hook **treason** ?? Because the improper requirements of (1) a filing fee, (2) the completion and filing of a Richland County form Civil Case Designation Sheet, and (3) the random assignment of a presiding/reviewing judge arguably took the undersigned's report outside the protective auspices or explicit scope of 18 U.S.C. § 2382, at least for purposes of submission, and the named likely co~conspirators could potentially claim deprivation of **due process** if not given notice and an opportunity to be heard on the merits of **any proceeding** concerning an 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report of potential charges of treason and related offenses that does **not** take place within the explicit scope of 18 U.S.C. § 2382.[1] As treason is the sole crime

[1] The undersigned's Praecipe for Service on Interested Persons and Organizations includes the following footnote at the bottom of the second page: "The undersigned Reporting Attorney issues this **Praecipe for Service** (which Due Process **now** requires since the undersigned's federally~mandated report of treason and related offenses has been forcibly and wrongfully removed from the protective auspices of 18 U.S.C. § 2382, at least for purposes of submission) under **protest** and **objection** to Judge Robinson's wrongful

specifically defined and proscribed by the Constitution of the United States (under Article III, Section 3, Clause 1), and as the undersigned has taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution on no less than five (5) occasions (for admission to practice before state and federal courts), the undersigned will **not** suffer to see **treason go unpunished**, and **traitors go free**, for lack of notice of an 18 U.S.C. §2382 report that primarily points to a federal court **Remand File** [Tab P1 to the Misprision Report (written)] and day, time, and location **news footage and photos** of the alleged mass school shooting event in question[2] to make a **peer~reviewed case** for **treason**.

Again, the undersigned's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States [also referred to as "Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report" and "Misprision Report (written)"] does **not** assert or seek adjudication of any claim for recovery, or any claim for injunctive relief, against any person, party, or organization. The undersigned's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report does **exactly what 18 U.S.C. § 2382 requires** a citizen having knowledge of treason against the United States to do [i.e., on pain of a fine and/or seven (7) years of imprisonment for noncompliance], namely, it "discloses and makes known" (i.e., it reports) the Sandy Hook treason to Judge Brent N. Robinson, an actively~serving judge of the State of Ohio of the undersigned's choosing, in full compliance with the terms of 18 U.S.C. § 2382, and it claims and seeks relief in the form of Judge Brent N. Robinson's **receipt**, **review**, and **judicial assessment of the credibility** of the undersigned's 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report of treason, as 18 U.S.C. § 2382 reasonably and necessarily requires of **both** federal **and** state judges, as statutorily~designated recipients of

---

refusal to abide by federal law as embodied in 18 U.S.C. § 2382 and as is required by the **Supremacy Clause**, U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2. See, also, *Testa v. Katt*, 330 U.S. 386 (1947)." [Emphasis as in original.]

[2] [see the undersigned's "My Sandy Hook Video Scrapbook" 43~minute compilation documentary video, Tab I9 to the Misprision Report (written), linked at: https://rumble.com/v5zc94k-always-wyn-episode-3-my-sandy-hook-video-scrapbook.html?e9s=src_v1_clr%2Csrc_v1_ucp_a]

federally~mandated reports of treason. As is set forth in the Requests for Relief section of the 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report, "the undersigned Reporting Attorney asks the Honorable Brent N. Robinson, a judge of the State of Ohio, to make a **single determination**, namely, whether the undersigned's Misprision Report Package presents a **credible report** of **treason**."[3]

If the reviewing judge[4] finds that the undersigned's Misprision Report Package presents a **credible** report of treason, **then** the undersigned requests three (3) additional forms of relief: (**1**) **disclosure** and reporting to the Governor of Ohio, as 18 U.S.C. § 2382 reasonably and necessarily requires, since further reporting of a credible report of treason must be made and since the President and the federal judiciary are demonstrably conflicted with respect to the Sandy Hook conspiracy;[5] (**2**) **disclosure** of this "critical matter of **public importance**"[6] to the public as (a) our society deems treason to be the most serious of all felony crimes,[7] (b) every day that a treasonous conspiracy against the United States continues, **unknown**, unchecked, and unpunished, is

---

[3] Misprision Report (written) at 159. [Emphasis as in original.] The Misprision Report Package consists of the Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States ["Misprision Report (written)"]; the Misprision Report Package Table of Contents; the text of the Misprision of treason statute, 18 U.S.C. § 2382 (designated "Tab A_Misprision of Treason Statute, 18 U.S.C. Section 2382"); the Affidavit of Reporting Attorney (designated "Tab B_Affidavit of Reporting Attorney"); and all documents, photographs, images, and recorded videos identified in and attached as Exhibits to the Affidavit of Reporting Attorney, at Tabs C through Z, and made parts of the Misprision Report Package.

[4] (the undersigned Reporting Attorney respectfully submits that, under the terms of 18 U.S.C. § 2382, the **reviewing judge** should be the statutorily~designated report recipient **of the undersigned's choosing**, here, Judge Brent N. Robinson of the Richland County, Ohio, Common Pleas Court; but, in view of the present removed status of this matter, now pending before the Honorable David A. Ruiz, the undersigned will simply refer to the "reviewing judge" without waiving objection to the initial review/assessment of the undersigned's 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report of treason being conducted **by anyone other than** the properly~qualifying, statutorily~designated report recipient **chosen by the undersigned**, namely, Judge Brent N. Robinson of the Richland County, Ohio, Common Pleas Court)

[5] See Misprision Report (written) at 113~158.

[6] *Id.* at 159.

[7] *People v. Lauria*, 251 Cal. App. 2d 471, 481 (Cal. App. 1967).

intolerably costly to our republic, and (c) the American people have an absolute right to be informed of this matter; and (**3**) **equitable relief**/assistance in the form of a request that the Governor of Ohio assist the undersigned in recovering reasonable attorney's fees and expenses incurred by the undersigned in exposing/litigating/preparing a credible report of treason on the Sandy Hook conspiracy, as a matter of ethical and statutory duty, pursuant to a valid claim under *Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32 (1991),[8] since "**no forum** presently exists in which the undersigned may effectively **pursue** such claim".[9]

The undersigned well understands that Judge Brent N. Robinson of the Richland County, Ohio, Common Pleas Court (or any state judge/court) does not have jurisdiction to adjudicate offenses against the laws of the United States[10] or to enter judgment against the U.S. Department of Justice on a *NASCO* claim.[11] That's why the undersigned's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report neither seeks nor requests such relief. However, under the express terms of 18 U.S.C. § 2382, the Supremacy Clause (U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2), and applicable case law, namely,

---

[8] (which held that **federal courts** possess inherent authority to award attorney's fees as a sanction for bad faith litigation conduct, even the entirety of fees caused and incurred, where the offending party's "entire course of conduct" during and even preceding litigation was "part of a sordid scheme"). 501 U.S. at 51, 57.

[9] (i.e., "as **the entire federal judiciary is demonstrably conflicted** in and with respect to the **treasonous** Sandy Hook matter, and the undersigned **cannot possibly** get a fair hearing/adjudication of the undersigned's *NASCO* claim in **any** federal court"). Misprision Report (written), Requests for Relief section, at Page 160. [Emphasis as in original.] See, also, Section III below.

[10] Per 18 U.S.C. § 3231.

[11] The DOJ is a **necessary party** to the undersigned Reporting Attorney's *NASCO* claim, as probable cause evidence shows the DOJ (**1**) orchestrated the sham Sandy Hook mass school shooting event of December 14, 2012, (**2**) is and has been controlling and/or financing the sham/collusive Sandy Hook defamation and product liability litigation, and (**3**) corruptly claimed a conflict of interest to prevent Attorney George F. Braun from sponsoring the undersigned for admission to the Bar of the Court of the Supreme Court of the United States in an attempt to block the undersigned's timely submission, by October 9, 2025, of an amicus brief in the matter of *Alex Emric Jones, et al., Petitioners v. Erica Lafferty, et al.*, S. Ct. Case No. 25-268, exposing the two~part and **treasonous** Sandy Hook conspiracy. See Misprision Report (written) at 70~72, 85, 90~93, and 150~51.

Testa v. Katt, 330 U.S. 386 (1947), and its progeny, Judge Brent N. Robinson of the Richland County, Ohio, Common Pleas Court, a judge of the State of Ohio of the undersigned's choosing, has both **subject matter jurisdiction** and **legal obligation** to receive, review, and conduct a judicial assessment of the credibility of the undersigned's 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report of treason.

What does Congress, under the terms of 18 U.S.C. § 2382, intend, expect, and require a government chief executive or judge (federal or state) to do with a mandatory a report of treason they receive ?? Reasonably and necessarily, to review the report of treason received and to **assess the credibility** of same. **What kind** of **assessment of credibility** does Congress, under the terms of 18 U.S.C. § 2382, reasonably and necessarily intend, expect, and require a federal or state chief **executive** to make ?? An **executive assessment**. **What kind** of **assessment of credibility** does Congress, under the terms of 18 U.S.C. § 2382, reasonably and necessarily intend, expect, and require a federal or state **judge** to make ?? A **judicial assessment**.

If Judge Robinson finds that the undersigned's Misprision Report Package presents a credible report of treason,[12] then Judge Robinson has both **subject matter jurisdiction** and **legal obligation** under 18 U.S.C. § 2382[13] to further report on (i.e., "disclose and make known") such credible report of treason in accordance with the terms of 18 U.S.C. § 2382, i.e., to the Governor of Ohio, since the President and the federal judiciary are demonstrably conflicted with respect to Sandy Hook, as is set forth and evidenced in the Misprision Report (written) and in the Affidavit of Reporting Attorney attached to the same.[14] Further, as a judge of the Richland County, Ohio,

[12] i.e., a "levying of war" against the United States, as defined by 18 U.S.C. § 2381 and by the Supreme Court of the United States in *Ex parte Bollman* and *Ex parte Swartwout*, 8 U.S. 75 (1807).

[13] i.e., since Judge Robinson is one "owing allegiance to the United States".

[14] See FN 5, *supra*.

Common Pleas Court, a court of general jurisdiction, Judge Robinson most assuredly has subject matter jurisdiction **in equity** to request that the Governor of Ohio assist a 31~year Ohio attorney, with a spotless record of conduct before the Supreme Court of Ohio, who has performed **thousands of hours of legal work**, over nearly three (3) years, **without pay**, as a matter of ethical and statutory duty, in service of the public interest, and in support and defense of the Constitution of the United States, in recovering on a valid *NASCO* claim, since "**no forum** presently exists in which the undersigned may effectively **pursue** such claim,"[15] and since it will likely take congressional support/action for the undersigned's *NASCO* claim to be recognized and paid.

The foregoing standards and obligations should and do apply to **any** report of treason that is submitted in compliance with the mandatory terms of 18 U.S.C. § 2382 to **any** reviewing judge. The **true nature** of the undersigned Reporting Attorney's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States has been **mischaracterized** and **distorted** by: (**1**) Judge Robinson's wrongful refusal, on September 9, 2026, to accept initial submission of the undersigned's report of treason pursuant to the express terms of 18 U.S.C. § 2382 and federal law; (**2**) the unlawful requirements that the undersigned pay a state court filing fee, complete a Richland County, Ohio, Civil Case Designation Sheet, and have the report randomly assigned to a reviewing judge on September 11, 2026; (**3**) the Richland County, Ohio, Clerk's unrequested and unauthorized issuance of summonses to the Interested Persons and Organizations the undersigned was/is duty~bound to identify as likely co~conspirators in the Misprision Report (written); (**4**) the improper removal to federal court, pursuant to 28 U.S. Code § 1442, of this matter, which is neither a "civil action" nor a "criminal prosecution", and which does not seek the issuance of any "judicial order" (see Section II below);

[15] See FN 9, *supra*.

and (**5**) the improper change in the designation of this matter from "*In re Robert Wyn Young, Reporting Attorney*", to "*Robert Wyn Young, Plaintiff v. Donald J. Trump, et al., Defendants*", in an obvious and unfounded attempt to **politicize** this matter.[16]

II. THIS COURT LACKS SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION IN AND OVER THIS MATTER UNDER THE EXPRESS TERMS OF 28 U.S.C. § 1442.

28 U.S.C. § 1442(a)(1), upon which the federal entities based their Notice of Removal, states, in pertinent part: "A **civil action** or **criminal prosecution** that is commenced in a State court and that is against or directed to any of the following may be removed by them to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place wherein it is pending: (1) The United States or any agency thereof or any officer (or any person acting under that officer) of the United States or of any agency thereof". [Emphasis added.] 28 U.S.C. § 1442(d)(1) states, in pertinent part: "The terms 'civil action' and 'criminal prosecution' include any proceeding (whether or not ancillary to another proceeding) to the extent that in such proceeding **a judicial order**, including a subpoena for testimony or documents, is sought or issued." [Emphasis added.]

In *Walters v. White*, 678 F. Supp. 1235 (E.D. Va. 1988), the Eastern District of Virginia noted that: "The Supreme Court has broadly construed the removal statute [28 U.S.C. § 1442(a)(1)], whose purpose 'was to provide a federal forum for cases where federal officials **must raise defenses** arising from their official duties.'" 678 F. Supp. 1240, FN 4, quoting *Willingham v. Morgan*, 395 U.S. 402, 405 (1969). [Emphasis added.] The undersigned Reporting Attorney's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason

[16] President Donald J. Trump is listed **next to last** among scores of persons and organization listed as likely co~conspirators in the Sandy Hook **treasonous** conspiracy in the **Probable Cause Exists for Charges, or for Further Justified and Formal Investigation of Potential Charges** section of the undersigned Reporting Attorney's Misprision Report (written) at 106~58.

Against the United States is neither a "civil action", nor a "criminal prosecution", and, thus, there are no defenses which must (or, logically, which even can) be raised by the federal entities.

The undersigned Reporting Attorney's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States is exactly what the title of the submission professes it to be. It is a report, **not** a Complaint; it seeks **no** recovery of damages **nor** any injunctive relief against any person or party; and it does **not** seek **a judicial order** of any kind. The undersigned's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report seeks what 18 U.S.C. § 2382 reasonably and necessarily requires, the **receipt**, **review**, and **judicial assessment of the credibility** of the undersigned's report of treason against the United States by a properly~qualified judge.[17] Accordingly, as the undersigned Reporting Attorney's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States does **not qualify** as a "civil action" or "criminal prosecution" under the express terms of 28 U.S.C. § 1442(d)(1): (**1**) the terms of 28 U.S.C. § 1442(a)(1) are **inapplicable**, (**2**) the federal entities' removal was and is **improper**, and (**3**) this matter should be **remanded** forthwith.

III. THE ENTIRE FEDERAL JUDICIARY IS CONFLICTED WITH RESPECT TO THE SANDY HOOK MATTER.

The undersigned's Misprision Report (written), at Pages 94~104, points to probable cause evidence demonstrating Sandy Hook was and is a two~part and continuing treasonous conspiracy. In 2025, the undersigned's litigation in the matters of *In re Alexander E. Jones, Debtor*, Bankr. S.D. Tex. Bankr. Case No. 22-33553; *In re Alexander E. Jones, Debtor, Robert Wyn Young, Appellant*, S.D. Tex. Civil Action Case No. 4:25-cv-02057; and *Alex Emric Jones, et al., Petitioners v. Lafferty, et al.*, S. Ct. Case No. 25-268, produced/uncovered probable cause evidence

[17] i.e., an actively~serving federal or state court judge of the undersigned's choosing.

of **systemic criminality** in the federal judiciary, itself, from **top to bottom**, respecting/regarding Sandy Hook that allowed for assignment of Connecticut Sandy Hook~related cases **only** to judges (federal or state) who would tolerate, permit, and facilitate **treasonous fraud**, i.e., who were and are **in on** the **treasonous** conspiracy. The undersigned pointed/points to evidence of **treasonous fraud** in the *Lafferty* federal court Remand File [Tab P1 to the Misprision Report (written)], namely, Alex Jones' Notice of Removal and Consents to same (Pgs. 11~82), which deliberately failed to claim federal question subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, despite the fact that the **fully dispositive federal question** (i.e., scope of First Amendment protections) was not only **apparent on the face** of the *Lafferty* Complaint (in 331 Paragraphs clearly and necessarily implicating First Amendment issues), but it was also **expressly raised** at ¶¶ 17, 18, and 19 (and FN2) at Page 2 of the Complaint (Pg. 24 of Remand File), ¶ 17 stating: "**The plaintiffs bring this action in defense of** the values protected by **the First Amendment** to the U.S. Constitution, not in derogation of it." [Emphasis added.]

If the undersigned is **wrong**, and the *Lafferty* federal court Remand File really does **not** contain operative, probable cause evidence of **treasonous fraud**:

- **Then why** was the undersigned's **intervention** in Alex Jones' bankruptcy, Case No. 22-33553, **to present evidence of fraudulent judgment** (namely, and primarily, the *Lafferty* federal court Remand File) **denied**[18] ?? And why was such improper denial improperly upheld on appeal in Case No. 4:25-cv-02057 ??[19]
- **Then why** did Alex Jones and his attorneys **violate the Supreme Court's mandatory disclosure rule** by failing to list, in the mandatory Related Proceedings section of his

[18] (even the admission of the evidence alone, without the undersigned's intervention, was denied) [Tab Q1_Order Denying Motion for Leave to Intervene (Bankr. Dckt. 1129) 04.22.25 at 2].

[19] See the **Extreme Abuse of Discretion, If Any** section of the Misprision Report (written) at 29~46.

Petition for Certiorari in *Lafferty* (pages v and vi),[20] the removed and remanded *Lafferty* federal case, No. 3:18-cv-01156, which proceeded in the Connecticut U.S. District Court for four (4) months in 2018, **in direct violation of Supreme Court Rule 14.1(b)(iii)** ??

- **Then why** did an **unnamed third~party** (i.e., an entity **not** named as a party in *Alex Emric Jones, et al., Petitioners v. Erica Lafferty, et al.*, S. Ct. Case No. 25-268) **claim a conflict of interest** to prevent Attorney George F. Braun from sponsoring the undersigned and to thus block, or ruinously delay, the undersigned's admission to the Bar of the Court and timely submission of an amicus brief in S. Ct. Case No. 25-268 exposing the Sandy Hook **treasonous fraud** ?? Probable cause evidence (and common sense) mandates a reasonable inference or conclusion that it was the FBI/DOJ, which was in publicly~apparent charge of the law enforcement "response" at Sandy Hook,[21] that claimed the conflict of interest for Attorney Braun. But even if it wasn't the FBI/DOJ that claimed a conflict of interest, it doesn't matter. The mere fact that **any unnamed third~party** had an interest in S. Ct. Case No. 25-268 that would be or was adversely affected by the submission of an amicus brief pointing to the *Lafferty* federal court Remand file as containing evidence of treasonous fraud **necessitates** the conclusion that **Sandy Hook was and is a conspiracy**.[22, 23]

  Indeed, **the claim of a conflict of interest** for Attorney Braun **was and is necessarily an admission that Sandy Hook was and is a fraudulent conspiracy**; it is the strongest of all the smoking~gun evidence pointed to in and by the undersigned's Misprision Report Package; and it establishes the **credibility** of the undersigned's instant Sandy Hook public case and report **as a matter of law**.[24] In short, by claiming the conflict, the perpetrators admitted the con. And the chief perpetrators in **Part II** of the **treasonous** Sandy Hook treasonous conspiracy, it is unfortunate to say, are the DOJ and the federal judiciary.

---

[20] (Tab T2 to Misprision Report Package)

[21] Tab I9 to Misprision Report (written), My Sandy Hook Video Scrapbook.

[22] To wit: If Sandy Hook was a **real** event, and 120 lb. Adam Lanza **really** did shoot through a wall of safety glass with an AR-15, get into the elementary school and, in less than five minutes, shoot **and kill** 20 first grade children and 6 adult educators, while injuring 2 others, as alleged at Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the *Lafferty* Complaint (Tab P1, Pg. 23), then how or why would **any** third party have **any interest** at stake in S. Ct. Case No. 25-268 that would be **adversely affected** by the submission of an amicus brief referencing an inaccurate "conspiracy theory" and simply pointing to the *Lafferty* federal court Remand File ??

[23] See Misprision Report (written) at 70~72, 85, 90~93, and 150~51; the undersigned's communications with Attorney Braun Tabs U1, U2, and U3 (attached as Exhibits 3~5); and the undersigned's Bar Application Package (Tab V2) and amicus brief in S. Ct. Case No. 25-268 (Tab V5) attached as Exhibits 6 and 7.

[24] i.e., meaning that reasonable minds cannot reasonably differ in this regard.

- And finally, **then why** did the Supreme Court of the United States **delay**, **slow~roll**, and thereafter **conceal**, the undersigned Reporting Attorney's amicus brief exposing the aforesaid overall, two~part, and general Sandy Hook **treasonous conspiracy** against the United States in violation of (**1**) its own precedential ruling in *Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.*, 322 U.S. 238, 246 (1944),[25] and (**2**) the express terms of the misprision statute, 18 U.S.C. § 2382 ??[26]

As the federal judiciary is demonstrably conflicted with respect to the Sandy Hook matter, and as Congress, in 18 U.S.C. § 2382, expressly provided for **concurrent jurisdiction** as between federal and state judges for the receipt/handling of reports of treason, this matter should and must be remanded to Judge Brent N. Robinson of the Richland County, Ohio, Common Pleas Court.

IV. JURISDICTION FOR RECEIPT, REVIEW, AND ASSESSMENT OF CREDIBILITY OF REPORTS OF TREASON IS CONCURRENT AS BETWEEN FEDERAL AND STATE OFFICIALS, AND THE UNDERSIGNED REPORTING ATTORNEY IS ENTITLED TO HAVE THE INSTANT 18 U.S.C. § 2382 REPORT OF TREASON REVIEWED AND ASSESSED BY THE STATUTORILY~DESIGNATED REPORT RECIPIENT OF THE UNDERSIGNED'S CHOOSING.

"In historically the most serious felony, treason, an individual with knowledge of the treason can be prosecuted for concealing and failing to disclose it." *People v. Lauria*, 251 Cal. App. 2d 471, 481 (Cal. App. 1967), *citing* 18 U.S.C. §2382, which states:

> Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States and having knowledge of the commission of any treason against them, conceals and does not, as soon as may be, disclose and make known the same to the President or to some judge of the United States, or to the governor or to some judge or justice of a particular State, is guilty of misprision of treason and shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than seven years, or both.

[25] The Supreme Court of the United States willingly served as a mute "[victim] of deception and fraud". In the case of a treasonous conspiracy, a willing victim, who or which assists in the conspiracy, is also known as a "co~conspirator", and as a "traitor", per *Ex parte Bollman* and *Ex parte Swartwout*, 8 U.S. 75 (1807), at Paragraph 3 of the Court Syllabus.

[26] See Misprision Report (written) at 147~50 (and all footnotes to the section re: Supreme Court personnel).

The language of 18 U.S.C. § 2382 expressly provides for **concurrent jurisdiction** as between federal and state judges concerning the receipt/handling of reports of treason by providing, in pertinent part, that a disclosure and report of treason against the United States may be made to, among others, "some judge or justice of a particular State".

18 U.S.C. § 2382 does **not** state that one owing allegiance to the United States and having knowledge of treason against them must report the matter to the governor in their home state, or to a federal or state judge in any particular jurisdiction. Thus, the statute provides the disclosing party with a considerable degree of **discretion in choosing** the particular federal or state chief executive or judge to whom the report will be made. This makes sense given that treason, the most serious felony, might be committed by either private or governmental actors, and the disclosing party should be free to report to a federal or state chief executive or judge whom they trust.

Congress did **not** vest state court judges with concurrent jurisdiction and obligation to receive, review, and assess the credibility of 18 U.S.C. § 2382 reports of treason simply to have such intentionally~placed state judge/court jurisdiction **negated** under 28 U.S.C. § 1442(a)(1) if and when federal officials are accused of treason. Indeed, it is reasonable to infer that Congress intentionally vested state court judges with concurrent jurisdiction under 18 U.S.C. § 2382 for the **very reason** that federal officials might be or become involved in a treasonous conspiracy against the United States. Accordingly, as subject matter jurisdiction in this matter properly rests in and with Judge Brent N. Robinson of the Richland County, Ohio, Court of Common Pleas, and as **no proper basis** exists for this Court's exercise of subject matter jurisdiction herein, this matter should be remanded forthwith.

V. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Reporting Attorney respectfully submits that the instant Motion to Remand is well~founded and well~taken, and it should be **granted**. Accordingly, the Court should issue an **Order** remanding this case, No. 1:26-cv-02727, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, back to Judge Brent N. Robinson of the Richland County, Ohio, Common Pleas Court. Further, and as requested in the separate Motion to Correct Case Caption/Style, such remand should be Ordered after the case caption/style for Case No. 1:26-cv-02727 has been corrected and changed back to its original designation as *In re Robert Wyn Young, Reporting Attorney*.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **10/30/2026**

/s/ *Robert Wyn Young*
Robert Wyn Young
(OH Bar #0064876) (U.S. S. Ct. Bar #326130)
Pro Se Reporting Attorney & Officer of the Court
Law Office of R. Wyn Young, Esq.
1421 Lexington Avenue, #180
Mansfield, OH 44907
Phone: (513) 238~2821
Email: rwynyoung25@gmail.com

LOCAL RULE 7.1(f) CERTIFICATION

Pursuant to Local Rule 7.1(f), the undersigned Reporting Attorney hereby certifies that the foregoing **Memorandum in Support of Motion to Remand**, being 15 pages in length, complies with the twenty (20) page limit for memoranda relating to dispositive motions in a standard track case (i.e., an "890 Other Statutory Action" case).

/s/ *Robert Wyn Young*
Robert Wyn Young

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on **October 30, 2026**, I caused a copy of the foregoing Reporting Attorney's **Memorandum in Support of Motion to Remand** to be served on all subscribed parties or interested persons and organizations by the Electronic Case Filing System of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio.

/s/ *Robert Wyn Young*
Robert Wyn Young