RICHLAND COUNTY, OHIO
10/14/2026 04:48 PM
HEIDI EWING
CLERK OF COURTS
2026 CV 0685 R
ROBINSON, JUDGE BRENT N

IN THE COMMON PLEAS COURT
RICHLAND COUNTY, OHIO

In Re:	)	**Case No. 2026 CV 0685 R**
ROBERT WYN YOUNG	)	**Judge Brent N. Robinson**
Reporting Attorney.	)	

REPORTING ATTORNEY'S RESPONSE TO MOTION TO DISMISS MISCELLANEOUS ACTION TO MAKE MANDATORY REPORT OF TREASON AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Reporting Attorney Robert Wyn Young respectfully submits that the Motion to Dismiss of James H. Fetzer, Ph.D. ("Dr. Fetzer") is not well~taken and not well~founded, and it should be denied. For this response in opposition, the undersigned Reporting Attorney hereby adopts and incorporates the opening and **Introduction and Jurisdictional Statement** of the undersigned's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States (Pages 1~11) as if fully rewritten herein. Under the express terms of 18 U.S.C. § 2382, the Supremacy Clause (U.S. Const. art VI, cl. 2), and applicable case law, Judge Brent N. Robinson of the Richland County, Ohio, Common Pleas Court has both subject matter jurisdiction and legal obligation to provide the relief requested in the undersigned's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, namely, the **receipt**, **review**, and **judicial assessment of the credibility** of the undersigned's Misprision Report Package proffered for submission to Judge Robinson in hard copy printed and USB flash drive form on September 9, 2026, and electronically filed with this Court, per verbal Order of Judge Robinson, on September 11, 2026.

The grounds for the undersigned Reporting Attorney's opposition to the instant Motion to Dismiss are more fully set forth in the following **Response in Opposition to Motion to Dismiss**.

RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO DISMISS

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT ON THE SUBMISSION, SERVICE, AND 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

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; 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 continuing objection, the undersigned Reporting Attorney 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 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, and (3) the random assignment of a presiding judge. The undersigned Reporting Attorney 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 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", 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, Dr. Fetzer is **not** a Defendant; rather, he is identified in the undersigned Reporting Attorney's 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report as a likely co~conspirator in the Sandy Hook treason, and he was issued notice 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 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. As treason is the sole crime 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 [see "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] to make a **peer~reviewed case** for **treason**.

The undersigned Reporting Attorney'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 Reporting Attorney'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 federally~mandated reports of treason. As is set forth in the Requests for Relief section of the Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory 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**."[1]

[1] 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.

If Judge Robinson finds that the undersigned Reporting Attorney'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;[2] (**2**) **disclosure** of this "critical matter of **public importance**"[3] to the public as (a) our society deems treason to be the most serious of all felony crimes,[4] (b) every day that a treasonous conspiracy against the United States continues, **unknown**, unchecked, and unpunished, is 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),[5] since "**no forum** presently exists in which the undersigned may effectively **pursue** such claim".[6]

---

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

[3] *Id.* at 159.

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

[5] (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.

[6] (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.]

The undersigned Reporting Attorney well understands that Judge Brent N. Robinson of the Richland County, Ohio, Common Pleas Court does not have jurisdiction to adjudicate offenses against the laws of the United States[7] or to enter judgment against the U.S. Department of Justice on a *NASCO* claim.[8] That's why the undersigned's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report neither seeks nor requests such relief.

However, as is more fully set forth with legal support below, under the express terms of 18 U.S.C. § 2382, the Supremacy Clause (U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2), and applicable case law, 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 Reporting Attorney's 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report of treason. If Judge Robinson finds that the undersigned's Misprision Report Package presents a credible report of treason,[9] then Judge Robinson has both **subject matter jurisdiction** and **legal obligation** under 18 U.S.C. § 2382[10] 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

---

[7] Per 18 U.S.C. § 3231.

[8] 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 Pages 70~72, 85, 90~93, and 150~51.

[9] 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).

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

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.[11]

Further, as a judge of the Richland County, Ohio, 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,"[12] and since it will likely take congressional support/action for the undersigned's *NASCO* claim to be recognized and paid.

II. PURSUANT TO THE TERMS OF 18 U.S.C. § 2382, JUDGE BRENT N. ROBINSON OF THE RICHLAND COUNTY, OHIO, COMMON PLEAS COURT HAS BOTH SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AND LEGAL OBLIGATION TO RECEIVE, TO REVIEW, AND TO CONDUCT A JUDICIAL ASSESSMENT OF THE CREDIBILITY OF THE UNDERSIGNED REPORTING ATTORNEY'S FEDERALLY~MANDATED REPORT OF TREASON & RELATED OFFENSES.

A. Arguments

Without citing any legal authority other than Ohio Civ. R. 12(B)(1), itself, Dr. Fetzer argues that the undersigned Reporting Attorney's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States should be dismissed, "Because the filing seeks relief that lies exclusively within federal executive authority, this Court lacks

[11] See FN 2, *supra*.

[12] See FN 6, *supra*.

subject-matter jurisdiction and must dismiss the action."[13] Dr. Fetzer specifically argues (again, without legal authority) that:

> State courts have **no jurisdiction** to:
>
> - investigate treason,
> - adjudicate treason,
> - compel reporting of treason,
> - issue "judicial assessments" of treason,
> - or order federal action.[14]

First, as is more fully set forth below in Section IV, **nowhere** in the 161~page Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States [Misprision Report (written)] does the undersigned Reporting Attorney request, suggest, or demand that Judge Robinson, or the Richland County, Ohio, Common Pleas Court in which he sits and presides, "investigate treason". The undersigned Reporting Attorney requests, and cites controlling federal statutory law requiring, that Judge Robinson receive, review, and conduct a judicial assessment of the credibility of the undersigned's Misprision Report Package on its merits and according to "the four corners of same" (i.e., without regard to or consideration of extraneous matters). Further, the undersigned's Misprision Report (written) does **not** request, suggest, or demand that Judge Robinson, or the Richland County, Ohio, Common Pleas Court in which he sits and presides, adjudicate treason, "compel reporting of treason",[15] or order any federal action. As is more fully set forth below, the undersigned Reporting Attorney **does** request that Judge Robinson conduct and prepare a written judicial assessment of the

---

[13] Motion to Dismiss at 2.

[14] *Id.* [Emphasis as in original.]

[15] (which doesn't even make sense, as it is 18 U.S.C. § 2382, i.e., federal statutory law, not state law, which compels the reporting of treason)

credibility of the undersigned's 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report of treason, as 18 U.S.C. § 2382 reasonably and necessarily requires.

Second, while Dr. Fetzer references the correct test for a court's **subject matter jurisdiction** under Ohio law, namely, **cognizability**,[16, 17] Dr. Fetzer fails to acknowledge, let alone address, the plain language of 18 U.S.C. § 2382, which expressly vests (1) federal **and** state chief executives (i.e., the President and state governors), and (2) federal **and** state judges, with **concurrent subject matter jurisdiction** regarding federally~mandated reports of treason.

18 U.S.C. § 2382 states as follows:

> 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.

By its express terms, 18 U.S.C. § 2382 vests (**1**) government chief executives (federal and state) and (**2**) judges (federal and state) with exclusive **subject matter jurisdiction** to receive and handle mandatory reports of treason. The language of 18 U.S.C. § 2382 thus expressly provides for **concurrent jurisdiction** as between federal and state chief executives and judges in this regard and context. Why does the undersigned describe this **concurrent subject matter jurisdiction** as "exclusive" ?? Because 18 U.S.C. § 2382 requires that reports of treason be made to **only two classes or types** of government officials, namely, chief executives and judges, federal and state; it does **not** allow for the submission of mandatory reports of treason to any other classes or types of

[16] Motion to Dismiss at 1.

[17] "In considering its jurisdiction pursuant to a Civ.R. 12(B)(1) motion to dismiss, the trial court 'determines whether the claim raises any action cognizable in that court.'" *Werner Properties, Inc. v. Gasearch, L.L.C.*, 8th Dist. Cuyahoga No. 111850, 2023-Ohio-1049, ¶ 25, quoting *Moore v. Ohio Dept. of Rehab. & Corr.*, 10th Dist. Franklin No. 18AP-599, 2019-Ohio-767, ¶ 4.

government officials, i.e., **not** to the police (federal or state), **not** to legislators (federal or state), and **not even** to attorneys general (federal[18] or state).

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**.

18 U.S.C. § 2382 does **not** speak to the **form** of a report of treason that it **requires** be submitted on pain of a possible fine and seven (7) years of imprisonment for noncompliance. The undersigned Reporting Attorney respectfully submits that it was and is both reasonable and necessary that the undersigned's report of the Sandy Hook treason (given the conspiracy's breadth, multifaceted nature, and length of continuance over time) be **in writing**. 18 U.S.C. § 2382 does **not** speak to the issue of whether a **mandatory** report of treason submitted to a judge (federal or state) should be or become a **court filing**. Most judges, in the undersigned Reporting Attorney's experience, will not consider **any** submission that is not in the form of a court filing, even something properly submitted on an *ex parte* basis.[19] Accordingly, in anticipation of such a

[18] (which, in and of itself, demonstrates the fallacy of Dr. Fetzer's argument, at Page 2 of the Motion to Dismiss, that 18 U.S.C. § 2382 is a "criminal [provision] enforceable only by the United States Department of Justice") [Bolding in original removed.]

[19] (and, indeed, on September 9, 2026, **sight unseen**, Judge Robinson Ordered the **court filing** of the undersigned Reporting Attorney's 18 U.S.C. § 2382 mandatory and proffered hard copy and USB flash

position or ruling by Judge Robinson, the undersigned Reporting Attorney prepared the undersigned's federally~mandated 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report of treason in the form of a court filing for the Richland County Common Pleas Court's miscellaneous docket, a "Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States", and captioned the action as *In re Robert Wyn Young, Reporting Attorney*. The undersigned Reporting Attorney respectfully submits that it was **entirely reasonable**, **if not necessary**, for the undersigned to prepare and submit the undersigned's federally~mandated 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report of treason in such manner and form.

Not knowing if, or at what point, following the anticipated September 9, 2026, in~person proffered submission of the undersigned's 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report of treason, Judge Robinson might Order the court filing of same, the undersigned prepared hard copy and USB flash drive versions of the undersigned's Misprision Report Package[20] [the original and three copies of same, each in a separate banker's box, and each box/Package consisting of three binders and two loose~leaf documents for "quick reference" usage by Judge Robinson/court personnel, namely, the text of the misprision of treason statute, 18 U.S.C. Section 2382, and FBI — Table 8 - Connecticut_Crime in the U.S. 2012 09.02.26, showing zero (0) Murder(s) and nonnegligent manslaughter(s) in Newtown, Connecticut, which includes Sandy Hook, in 2012], and, on September 9, 2026, the undersigned transported the Misprision Report Packages to the Richland County Common Pleas Court for proffering/submission of same to Judge Brent N. Robinson, a judge of the State of Ohio of the undersigned's choosing, all as in reasonable and necessary compliance with 18 U.S.C. § 2382.

---

drive formatted report of treason, which the undersigned thereafter duly filed in the Richland County Common Pleas Court, in electronic format, on September 11, 2026)

[20] See FN 1, *supra*.

The undersigned Reporting Attorney also believed it **crucial** that Judge Robinson see and review the **Introduction and Jurisdictional Statement** of the Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report[21] **before any filing** of same because, "the submission and handling of reports of treason against the United States are entirely governed by the parameters of 18 U.S.C. § 2382. Thus, under the Supremacy Clause (U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2), no Ohio Rule of Procedure, nor any local rule of court, may serve as an obstacle, impediment, or condition precedent to the submission and recording of the undersigned's 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report."[22] The **Introduction and Jurisdictional Statement** of the Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report further states:

> The terms of 18 U.S.C. § 2382 clearly contemplate the ex parte communication of a report of treason by and from the reporter directly to a federal or state judge of the reporter's choosing. 18 U.S.C. § 2382 does not provide for any adversarial procedure. Nor does it require that notice and opportunities to be heard be given to the alleged offenders. Any such requirements would discourage the submission of reports of treason, thus defeating the overall purpose of 18 U.S.C. § 2382 and the disclosure and reporting obligations it necessarily creates.[23]

At the conclusion of the **Introduction and Jurisdictional Statement** of the Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, the undersigned Reporting Attorney requests[ed], in addition to the receipt of the Misprision Report Package and a short, same~day hearing on same (for the undersigned to make a short statement on the court record and answer any initial questions), that Judge Robinson:

> **order the Clerk of Courts** to immediately **open a miscellaneous action** for, to file, and to assign a case number for this submitted report of treason and related crimes **free from and regardless of any filing fee, form submission, or service of process requirements** under Richland County Local Rule 2: CIVIL CASE MANAGEMENT, and to **assign this matter to Judge Robinson** (a judge of the

[21] Misprision Report (written) at 4~11.

[22] *Id.* at 8.

[23] *Id.* at 8~9.

State of Ohio of the reporter's choosing) regardless of Richland County Local Rule 7: ASSIGNMENT OF JUDGES[.][24]

Contrary to these reasonable, necessary, and lawful requests, on September 9, 2026, Judge Robinson refused to give the undersigned Reporting Attorney any audience whatsoever, instead, verbally Ordering, through his Bailiff, that the undersigned file the 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report of treason subject to normal state/local filing fees, form submission requirements, and the random assignment of a presiding judge. The undersigned Reporting Attorney objected to such requirements (again, through back~and~forth, in~person verbal communications with Judge Robinson's Bailiff on the afternoon of September 9, 2026) and asserted that **federal authority**, as embodied in the misprision of treason statute, 18 U.S.C. § 2382, does **not** allow for such state or local requirements, impediments, or restrictions and that, under the Supremacy Clause, such state or local requirements, impediments, or restrictions were and are **inapplicable** and, if forced upon the undersigned in order to submit a federally~mandated report, **unlawful**, as a matter of law. The undersigned even gave Judge Robinson's Bailiff a loose~leaf copy of 18 U.S.C. § 2382 and the **Introduction and Jurisdictional Statement** of the Misprision Report (written) to take back to Judge Robinson for in~chambers review, all to no avail.

On September 11, 2026, and under continuing objection, the undersigned Reporting Attorney 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 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, and (3) the random assignment of a presiding judge. As

[24] *Id.* at 10. [Emphasis as in original.]

Richland County's random process apparently selected the state court judge of the undersigned reporter's choosing, namely, Judge Robinson, the third objection becomes moot.

On pain of a possible fine and/or seven (7) years of imprisonment, 18 U.S.C. § 2382 obligates one "owing allegiance to the United States" and "having knowledge of the commission of any treason against them" to not conceal and to "disclose and make known" (i.e., to report) the same to an **actively~serving** President, state governor, or federal or state judge. 18 U.S.C. § 2382 does **not** state, or in any way indicate, that a mandatory report of treason may be made to a **former** President or state governor, or to a **retired** federal or state judge, and any such interpretation of the statute would be unreasonable. Reports of treason may and must be made **only** to **actively~serving** chief executives and judges, federal and state.

Actively~serving judges are necessarily and inextricably **linked to the courts** in which they sit and preside. Thus, Congress, in drafting 18 U.S.C. § 2382, obviously anticipated, and it obviously expects, that disclosures (i.e., reports) of treason will and must, upon submission to federal and state judges, become **matters of court record** for review, consideration, and assessment of credibility by the duly qualified judges[25] to whom such reports are submitted. Accordingly, as 18 U.S.C. § 2382 necessarily vests Judge Brent N. Robinson, an actively~serving judge of the State of Ohio of the undersigned Reporting Attorney's choosing, with subject matter jurisdiction and obligation to receive, review, and assess the credibility of the undersigned's 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report of treason, and as an actively~serving judge is necessarily and inextricably linked to the court in which he sits and presides, this matter is most assuredly **cognizable** in the Richland County Common Pleas Court, i.e., the "forum" in which Judge Robinson sits and presides.

[25] A "duly qualified judge", in the context of 18 U.S.C. § 2382, simply means an **actively~serving** federal or state judge **of the reporter's choosing**.

As is set forth and substantiated below, the foregoing arguments presented and positions taken by the undersigned Reporting Attorney respecting jurisdiction and rules for the submission and handling of 18 U.S.C. § 2382 reports of treason are not only **validated**, but they are also **mandated**, by controlling federal law.

B. Controlling Law

The Supremacy Clause, U.S. Const. art VI, cl. 2, states as follows:

> This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

In *Testa v. Katt*, 330 U.S. 386 (1947), the Supreme Court of the United States "unanimously held that Congress could constitutionally require state courts to hear and decide Emergency Price Control Act cases involving the enforcement of federal penal laws[.]" *Palmore v. United States*, 411 U.S. 389, 402 (1973). The *Testa* Court, citing the Supremacy Clause, noted that "the obligation of states to enforce these federal laws is not lessened by reason of the form in which they are cast or the remedy which they provide." 330 U.S. at 391. Recounting its prior seminal decision following the Civil War in *Claflin v. Houseman*, 93 U. S. 130 (1876), the *Testa* Court observed that *Claflin* "thus answered most of the arguments theretofore advanced against the power and duty of state courts to enforce federal penal laws. And since that decision, the remaining areas of doubt have been steadily narrowed." *Testa*, 330 U.S. at 391. The *Testa* Court also relied upon and quoted its earlier decision in *Mondou v. New York, N. H. & H. R. Co.*, 223 U.S. 1 (1912), which held:

> The suggestion that the act of Congress is not in harmony with the policy of the State, and therefore that the courts of the State are free to **decline jurisdiction**, is quite inadmissible, because it presupposes what in legal contemplation does not

> exist. When Congress, in the exertion of the power confided to it by the Constitution, adopted that act, it spoke for all the people and all the States, and thereby established a policy for all. That policy is as much the policy of Connecticut as if the act had emanated from its own legislature, and should be respected accordingly in the courts of the State.

Testa, *supra*, at 392, quoting *Mondou*, *supra*, at 57. [Emphasis added.]

Since 1947, the seminal ruling in *Testa* has been repeatedly reaffirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States and applied by numerous lower/other courts in multiple jurisdictions, federal and state, in multiple contexts and circumstances, that are both relevant to and govern this matter. The Supremacy Clause, *Testa*, and its progeny constitute controlling authority in this matter, and such authorities establish the validity of the undersigned Reporting Attorney's arguments and positions respecting both (**1**) this Court's **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, and (**2**) the **non~applicability** of state and/or local rules that, in any way, act as obstacles, impediments, or conditions precedent to the submission, recording, and judicial assessment of the credibility of the undersigned's federally~mandated 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report of treason.

In *Discover Bank v. Vaden*, 489 F.3d 594, 609~610 (4th Cir. 2007), the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals observed:

> The Supreme Court has held that not only do **state courts** have the ability to hear federal claims, but that in all but the most exceptional circumstances they **must hear federal claims**. *See generally Testa v. Katt*, [citation omitted] (establishing that state courts have a general obligation to hear federal claims). This **ability and obligation of state courts to** hear federal claims and **enforce federal law** is derived from the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution. [Emphasis added.]

In *Connecticut Bank of Commerce v. Republic of Congo*, 440 F. Supp. 2d 346 (D. Del. 2006), the District of Delaware cited *Testa*, *supra*, generally, as "requiring state courts of general jurisdiction

to entertain claims predicated on federal law where Congress has conferred concurrent jurisdiction". 440 F. Supp. 2d at 349. As is set forth above, 18 U.S.C. § 2382 expressly vests state court judges (and the courts in which they sit and preside) with **concurrent subject matter jurisdiction** to receive, review, and judicially assess the credibility of 18 U.S.C. § 2382 reports of treason. The Supremacy Clause creates **legal obligation** for state judges and courts to do so.

"[S]tate courts are obligated to **apply** and **enforce federal law**." *Evans v. Thompson*, 465 F. Supp. 2d 62, 73 (D. Mass. 2006) [emphasis added], citing *Printz v. United States*, 521 U.S. 898, 907 (1997), and *Testa*, 330 U.S. at 389~90. In the matter of *In Re Pfohl Bros. Landfill Litigation*, 26 F. Supp. 2d 512, 546 (W.D. NY 1998), the Western District of New York stated, "it is permissible for a federal statute representing an exercise of an enumerated power to **direct its enforcement by a state court** under the Supremacy Clause." [Emphasis added.] The District Court further noted that it is "well established that where Congress requires **access to state courts**, no Tenth Amendment violation occurs." *Id.* at 545 [emphasis added], citing *Testa*, 330 U.S. at 393. This is precisely what 18 U.S.C. § 2382 does in **mandating** a report of any known treason "to some judge or justice of a particular State".[26]

In *James Joseph Brown v. United States*, 748 F.3d 1045 (11th Cir. 2014), the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals notes, as **Dr. Fetzer argues**, and as the **undersigned** Reporting Attorney **concedes**, that: "Congress has chosen to grant federal courts exclusive jurisdiction over 'all offenses against the laws of the United States.' 18 U.S.C. § 3231 (2012)." 748 F.3d at FN 52. However, in the very next sentence, the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals states: "Simply because Congress granted exclusive jurisdiction to federal courts, however, does **not** necessarily mean that it could not grant state courts **some responsibility** to administer federal criminal law." *Id.*, citing

[26] i.e., or to the President of the United States, a state governor, or a federal judge; but nobody else. See text of 18 U.S.C. § 2382.

Testa, *supra*, at 391~94. [Emphasis added.] This is precisely what 18 U.S.C. § 2382 does in reasonably and necessarily **requiring** that a state court judge, as a statutorily~designated recipient of a federally~mandated report of treason, (1) receive, (2) review, and (3) assess the credibility of a submitted report of treason.

In *FERC v. Mississippi*, 456 U.S. 742 (1982), the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that state utility regulatory commissions were equivalent to judicial tribunals and the federal government, therefore, had the power to **require** these **tribunals to enforce federal law** under the holding in *Testa*, *supra*. The Court concluded that federal statutes could require state decisionmakers **to take** or refrain from taking **actions**. 456 U.S. at 762. In *South Carolina State Ports Authority v. Federal Maritime Commission*, 243 F.3d 165 (4th Cir. 2001), the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals held that: "State officers, no less than federal ones, take an oath to support and defend the Constitution and the laws of the United States. [Citing *Alden v. Maine*, 527 U.S. 706, 715 (1999).] The Supremacy Clause, of course, makes it clear that state officials have a duty to obey and enforce those same laws. See, e.g., *Testa* [citation omitted]." 243 F.3d 165, ¶ 41. These cases further validate the position that, via 18 U.S.C. § 2382, Congress has lawfully **vested** state court judges (and the state courts in which they sit) with **concurrent subject matter jurisdiction** and **legal obligation** to (1) receive, (2) review, and (3) assess the credibility of reports of treason submitted to them.

In 1959, the New Jersey Superior Appellate Court cited *Testa*, *supra*, for the proposition that the Supremacy Clause "prohibits state courts from applying local law and [they] must enforce federal law". *Frueh v. Kupper*, 148 A.2d 743, 54 N.J. Super. 296, 303 (N.J. Super. Ct. 1959). Three years later, the Supreme Court of the United States held that "any state law, however clearly within a State's acknowledged power, which interferes with or is contrary to federal law must yield."

Free v. Bland, 369 U.S. 663, 666 (1962). In 2005, the Supreme Court of Rhode Island followed and quoted *Testa*, *supra*, in holding that "state constitutional and statutory law is subordinate to the constitutional powers of the federal government, and 'the Constitution and the laws passed pursuant to it are the supreme laws of the land, binding alike upon states, courts, and the people'". *McKenna v. Williams*, 874 A.2d 217, 237 (R.I. 2005), citing and quoting *Testa*, *supra*, at 391~92. Finally, in this regard, the Eastern District of Michigan, in its 1987 decision in *State of Mich. v. Meese*, 666 F. Supp. 974, 979, FN 6 (E.D. Mich. 1987), cited *Testa*, *supra*, generally, as "upholding [the] binding nature of penal provisions of [the] Emergency Price Control Act on state courts under [the] supremacy clause". The Eastern District of Michigan further noted that the Supreme Court of the United States "has several times struck state judicial procedural rules in order to further a federal legislative goal or protect a federal statutory right." 666 F. Supp. 979, FN 6, citing *International Longshoreman's Ass'n, AFL-CIO v. Davis*, 476 U.S. 380 (1986) (striking state pleading rule to protect preemption of National Labor Relations Act); and *Dice v. Akron, Canton & Youngstown R.R.*, 342 U.S. 359 (1952) (striking state procedural rule to protect right of recovery under Federal Employers' Liability Act).

As the foregoing case authorities make clear, under the Supremacy Clause, U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2, *Testa v. Katt*, 330 U.S. 386 (1947), and its cited progeny, and pursuant to the plain language of 18 U.S.C. § 2382, Judge Brent N. Robinson of the Richland County, Ohio, Common Pleas Court has both **subject matter jurisdiction** and **legal obligation** to receive, to review, and to conduct a judicial assessment of the credibility of the undersigned Reporting Attorney's federally~mandated report of treason and related offenses. Further, as is stated in the **Introduction and Jurisdictional Statement** of the Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, "no Ohio Rule of Procedure, nor any local rule of court, may serve as an obstacle, impediment, or condition

precedent to the submission and recording,"[27] or to the review and assessment of the credibility of, the undersigned's 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report of treason. Accordingly, while **no provision** of Ohio law may serve to negate the **subject matter jurisdiction** Congress has necessarily conferred on Judge Robinson, and this Court, via 18 U.S.C. § 2382, and, thus, this Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report is **not** subject to being dismissed under Ohio Civ. R. 12(B)(1), it must **nevertheless** be said that this Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report is most assuredly **cognizable in this forum** and, therefore, it meets the test for **subject matter jurisdiction** in an Ohio court in any event.[28]

III. THE UNDERSIGNED REPORTING ATTORNEY'S FEDERALLY~MANDATED REPORT OF TREASON & RELATED OFFENSES IS NOT SUBJECT TO BEING DISMISSED PURSUANT OHIO CIVIL RULE 12(B)(6); BUT THE 18 U.S.C. § 2382 REPORT NEVERTHELESS STATES A CLAIM, CAUSE, OR OBLIGATION FOR COURT ACTION/RELIEF UNDER FEDERAL LAW THAT CAN AND, UNDER THE SUPREMACY CLAUSE, MUST BE GRANTED BY AN OHIO JUDGE AND COURT.

Citing Ohio Civ. R. 12(B)(6), Dr. Fetzer argues that the undersigned Reporting Attorney's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States "must be dismissed because it does not state a claim upon which relief can be granted."[29]

Under Ohio Civ. R. 12(B)(6), dismissal is appropriate only where "it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief." *O'Brien v. Univ. Community Tenants Union, Inc.*, 42 Ohio St.2d 242, 245 (1975), quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 45 (1957). The court, moreover, is required to "accept as true all factual

[27] Misprision Report (written) at 8.

[28] See FN 17, *supra*.

[29] Motion to Dismiss at 2.

allegations in the complaint." *Mitchell v. Lawson Milk Co.*, 40 Ohio St.3d 190, 192 (1988). However, conclusory allegations are insufficient to withstand a motion to dismiss. *Id.* at 193.

Subject matter jurisdiction for this miscellaneous matter is established by **federal law** (see Section II above), and the triggers and obligations for **relief** are set forth by the express terms of 18 U.S.C. § 2382, itself, and the reasonable interpretation and application of same. This Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States is **not** a complaint for recovery or for injunctive relief, it **needn't** meet any additional test for justiciability under Ohio law, and it is **not** subject to being dismissed pursuant to Ohio Civ. R. 12(B)(6) because it allegedly fails to "state a claim upon which relief can be granted".[30]

Even though this Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States is **not** subject to Ohio Civ. R. 12(B)(6), it **nevertheless** meets the standard under said Ohio rule as it **does** state a claim, cause, or obligation **under federal law** upon which **relief** can and **must** be granted by this Court in accordance with the Supremacy Clause, *Testa v. Katt*, *supra*, and its progeny.

The claim, cause, or obligation for court action/relief sought in and by 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 plainly set forth in the title and caption of the filing, itself. To wit: the undersigned Reporting Attorney seeks the **receipt**, **review**, and **judicial assessment of the credibility** of the undersigned's federally~mandated report of treason and related offenses against the United States by Judge Brent N. Robinson, a judge of the State of Ohio of the undersigned's choosing, in accordance and compliance with the terms of 18 U.S.C. § 2382.

[30] See *Frueh v. Kupper*, *Free v. Bland*, *McKenna v. Williams*, and *State of Mich. v. Meese*, *supra*.

This is most assuredly relief that can and, under the Supremacy Clause and *Testa v. Katt*, *supra*, and its progeny cited and quoted above, **must** be afforded.

If Judge Robinson finds the undersigned's report of treason and related offenses to be credible[31] (a singular determination), **then** the undersigned seeks three (3) additional forms of relief under law or in equity, namely: (**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 in accordance with the terms of 18 U.S.C. § 2382 and since the President and the federal judiciary are demonstrably conflicted with respect to the Sandy Hook conspiracy;[32] (**2**) **disclosure** of this "critical matter of **public importance**"[33] **to the public** as (a) our society deems treason to be the most serious of all felony crimes,[34] (b) every day that a treasonous conspiracy against the United States continues, **unknown**, unchecked, and unpunished, is 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.*, *supra*, since "**no forum** presently exists in which the undersigned may effectively **pursue** such claim".[35] Again, this is **relief** that, in the first instance, is **mandated** by

---

[31] Merriam-Webster defines "credible" as "offering reasonable grounds for being believed or trusted". Retrieved from: https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/credible.

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

[33] Misprision Report (written) at 159.

[34] See FN 4, *supra*.

[35] Misprision Report (written) at 160.

federal statute (i.e., 18 U.S.C. § 2382) where a credible report of treason is presented, and, in the second and third instances, is **warranted** by **justice** and **equity**, which are most assuredly within the power of Judge Robinson and the Richland County Common Pleas Court to dispense.

IV. ASSERTIONS AND ARGUMENTS MADE IN BAD FAITH

In his Motion to Dismiss, Dr. Fetzer, as a person named as a likely co~conspirator in the Sandy Hook treason in the undersigned Reporting Attorney's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report,[36] makes several assertions and arguments that the undersigned respectfully submits are **false** and **wholly unsupported** and were **interposed** by Dr. Fetzer,[37] **in bad faith**, in order to secure a dismissal of the undersigned's federally~mandated 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report of treason.

Throughout his three (3) page Motion to Dismiss, Dr. Fetzer, without citing a single example, repeatedly asserts that the undersigned "demands that this Court investigate" treason. **Nowhere** in the undersigned's 161~page Misprision Report (written) does this Reporting Attorney request, suggest, or demand that Judge Robinson or the Richland County Common Pleas Court "investigate treason". The undersigned Reporting Attorney requests, and cites controlling federal statutory law requiring, that Judge Robinson receive, review, and conduct a judicial assessment of the credibility of the undersigned's Misprision Report Package on its merits and according to "the four corners of same" (i.e., without regard to or consideration of extraneous matters). The

[36] Misprision Report (written) at 55~62 and 122~124.

[37] "A conspiracy is a partnership in criminal purposes. That, as such, it may have continuation in time is shown by the rule that an overt act of one partner may be the act of all without any new agreement specifically directed to that act." *United States v. Kissel*, 218 U. S. 601, 608 (1910). Further, a co~conspirator "becomes responsible for the acts of his co-conspirators in pursuit of their common plot". *Smith v. United States*, 568 U.S. 106, 111 (2013), citing *Pinkerton v. United States*, 328 U. S. 640, 646 (1946). Thus, if Dr. Fetzer is a co~conspirator in the Sandy Hook treason (which the undersigned asserts he is), then his bad faith conduct, in asserting false and unsupported assertions and arguments, must be attributed to **all the co~conspirators** in the Sandy Hook treason.

undersigned Reporting Attorney respectfully submits that Dr. Fetzer deliberately and inaccurately employed the term "investigate" in order to paint this Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report **outside** or **beyond the scope** and jurisdiction of 18 U.S.C. § 2382. If, in reply, Dr. Fetzer fails to cite (i.e., quote) an example in the 161~page Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States where the undersigned requests or demands that Judge Robinson or the Richland County Common Pleas Court "investigate treason", then **bad faith** in the interposition of this assertion should be deemed as established.

At Page 2 of the Motion to Dismiss, and (ironically enough) **without citing a single example**, Dr. Fetzer asserts that the undersigned Reporting Attorney's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States "consists entirely of conclusory accusations of federal crimes and political assertions." The undersigned **expressly denies** the existence of "conclusory accusations of federal crimes" and/or "political assertions" in the Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States.

FindLaw defines "conclusory" as "consisting of or relating to a conclusion or assertion for which no supporting evidence is offered [allegations]".[38] 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 161 pages in length; it has 343 footnotes; it is supported by an Affidavit of Reporting Attorney that is 56 pages in length, has 95 Paragraphs, and authenticates and attaches more than 100 Exhibits, consisting primarily of court filings and legally~operative email communications with attorneys and court personnel; it includes a **Probable Cause Exists for**

[38] Retrieved from: https://dictionary.findlaw.com/definition/conclusory.html.

Charges section that is 52 pages in length, primarily with bullet point, 1.15 line spacing, which delineates and points to evidence for **all allegations asserted**;[39] and it sets forth and follows a cogent and orderly narrative Outline.[40]

The undersigned Reporting Attorney respectfully submits that Dr. Fetzer's allegation that the undersigned's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States "consists entirely of conclusory accusation**s** of federal crimes" [emphasis added to show usage of plural form] is a **blatantly false assertion**, interposed in **bad faith**, in an attempt to obtain a dismissal of this matter since, under Ohio law, conclusory allegations are insufficient to withstand a motion to dismiss. *Mitchell v. Lawson Milk Co.*, *supra*, at 193. This is the exact same sort of 180º **inversion of truth** as is apparent in every aspect of the Sandy Hook treason and as is regularly employed by the likely co~conspirators as the modus for protecting or "**concealing**" the truth of the treasonous conspiracy.[41] If, in reply, Dr. Fetzer fails to cite (i.e., quote) **two** (**2**) **examples** in the 161~page Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States where the undersigned makes a **conclusory** accusation of a federal crime, i.e., without supporting evidence, then **bad faith** in the interposition of this assertion should be deemed as established.

As set forth above, Dr. Fetzer also asserts that the undersigned Reporting Attorney's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States "consists entirely of … political assertion**s**."[42] [Emphasis added to show

---

[39] Misprision Report (written) at 106~158.

[40] *Id.* at 3.

[41] *Id.* at 138.

[42] Motion to Dismiss at 2.

usage of plural form.] The undersigned **expressly denies** the existence of "political assertions" in the Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States. This was and is a **false assertion**, put forth to **discredit** the undersigned Reporting Attorney's professionalism and to **marginalize** a comprehensive report prepared and submitted pursuant to statutory and ethical obligation, concerning what our society considers to be the most serious of all felony crimes, **treason**. If, in reply, Dr. Fetzer fails to cite (i.e., quote) **two** (**2**) **examples** in the 161~page Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States where the undersigned makes **political assertions**, then **bad faith** in the interposition of said allegation, by Dr. Fetzer, should be deemed as established.

Finally in this regard, Dr. Fetzer argues that the undersigned's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States should be **dismissed**, **with prejudice**, because:

> The filing does not allege:
>
> - any tort recognized under Ohio law,
> - any contract,
> - any statutory civil claim,
> - any injury,
> - or any facts that could give rise to civil liability.[43]

The notion that a federally~mandated report of **treason** against the United States (the most serious of all felony crimes) should be **dismissed with prejudice**, because it fails to state a claim giving rise to civil liability under Ohio law, is **ridiculous**. Or, as the Supreme Court of the United States stated in describing a similarly inane argument in *Mondou*, *supra*, Dr. Fetzer's argument "is quite

[43] Motion to Dismiss at 2 and 3.

inadmissible, because it presupposes what in legal contemplation does not exist." *Mondou* at 57. If, in reply, Dr. Fetzer fails to cite any **applicable legal authority** that would support the dismissal of a federally~mandated report of treason for failing to state a claim for civil recovery under substantive state law, then **bad faith** in the interposition of this assertion should be deemed as established.

Dr. Fetzer's status as a pro se litigant should not excuse his interposition of **bad faith** assertions and arguments. Dr. Fetzer is no stranger to the litigation process.[44] And, as an academic and investigative research book author, he **should be** no stranger to **logic** or **backing up** what he asserts.

V. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the undersigned Reporting Attorney respectfully submits that Dr. James Fetzer's Motion to Dismiss the undersigned's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States is **not** well~taken and **not** well~founded, and it should be **denied**.

Further, **if**, in reply, Dr. Fetzer **fails to support the assertions and arguments** identified above in Section IV. ASSERTIONS AND ARGUMENTS MADE IN BAD FAITH (**1**) by and with specific citations to/quotes from the undersigned's Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States in support of the identified and alleged bad faith assertions, and/or (**2**) by and with citation to legal authority in support of the identified and alleged bad faith arguments, **then** such assertions and/or arguments made by Dr. Fetzer and identified above in Section IV should, indeed, be deemed and ruled by this Court to have been made in **bad faith**.

[44] Misprision Report (written) at 122~24.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **10/14/2026**

/s/ *Robert Wyn Young*
Robert Wyn Young
(OH Bar #0064876)
(U.S. Supreme Court 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

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned Reporting Attorney hereby certifies that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing **Response to Motion to Dismiss Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report of Treason Against the United States** was served, via the Court's e-filing system, on all appearing parties or interested persons or organizations and, via ordinary U.S. Mail, on James Fetzer, Ph.D., at 800 Violet Lane, Oregon, WI 53575, on this 14th day of October, 2026.

/s/ *Robert Wyn Young*
Robert Wyn Young