Supreme Court of the United States

Jeffrey T. Maehr,

Petitioner

V

John Koskinen, Commissioner of Internal Revenue; et al,

Respondents

MOTION FOR FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Petitioner comes before this court with this Motion for Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, as stipulated in this courts rulings in *Butz v. Economou* and *Federal Maritime Commission V. South Carolina State Ports Authority* (¹)

Petitioner is puzzled that this court appears to not be following Federal Rules for court actions and he prays for findings and laws which this court is functioning under if not the Federal court rules. Petitioner cannot find a separate set of rules or laws by Congress especially for this Supreme Court to follow, and requests clarification of said rules that conflict with Federal Court rules.

The Motion for Default Judgment with affidavit previously sent to the court under

¹ "The parties are entitled to know the findings and conclusions on all of the issues of fact, law, or discretion presented on the record." Citing *Butz v. Economou* 438 U.S. 478, 98 S. Ct. 2894, 57 L. Ed. 2d 895, (1978). *Federal Maritime Commission V. South Carolina State Ports Authority* et al. certiorari to the united states court of appeals for the fourth circuit No. 01-46. 2.535 U.S. 743, 122 S. Ct. 1864, 152 L. Ed. 2d 962, (2002). Argued February 25, 2002--Decided May 28, 2002. See also FRCPA Rule 52(a) and *United States v. Lovasco* 431 U.S. 783 (06/09/77), 97 S. Ct. 2044, 52 L. Ed. 2d 752, and *Holt v. United States* 218 U.S. 245 (10/31/10), 54 L. Ed. 1021, 31 S. Ct.

Rule 55(2) has been court stamped, but returned without being filed. Petitioner contends that this rule is binding on this court where a party to the case fails to rebut or respond to the clear charges.

The court denied Petition despite constitutional and statutory conflicts in the record. This court appears to be contradicting its own stare decisis in denying petition and evidence of record to be heard and rebutted. Petitioner requests the laws and authority sources for this case to be denied and due process to be deprived Petitioner.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey T. Maehr

924 E. Stollsteimer Rd.,

Pagosa Springs, Colorado 81147

Jeffrey / March

970-731-9724

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Jeffrey T. Maehr, do declare that on May 25th, 2017, I served a copy of the Motion for Findings of Fact and Conclusions of law on the person required to be served, by depositing an envelope containing the above documents in the United States mail properly addressed to him as follows:

1. Solicitor General of the United States, Room 5616, Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Ave., N. W., Washington, DC 20530-0001.

Dated May 25th, 2017

Jeffrey T. Maehr

² Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: Rule 55. Default; Default Judgment

⁽a) ENTERING A DEFAULT. When a party against whom a judgment for affirmative relief is sought has failed to plead or otherwise defend, and that failure is shown by affidavit or otherwise, the clerk must enter the party's default.

Jeff Sessions, AG U.S. Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530-0001

May 25th, 2017

RE: IRS/Court Collusion and Fraud - Case #16-8625

Dear Mr. Sessions,

I am copying you on my Motion for Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law to the Supreme Court. The court failed to file a default judgment against the Defendant IRS as required by Rule 55, and actually returned it to me.

Are you in support of this type of suppression of evidence and obstruction of justice for millions of Americans? Is this how the draining of the swamp this administration spoke about is occurring? Do we have two sets of laws now in America and are you defending lawlessness?

We are in serious trouble in this Republic if this is the administration's stance on the law and constitution.

March

Sincerely,

Jeffrey T. Maehr,

924 E. Stollsteimer Rd.,

Pagosa Springs, Colorado 81147

970-731-9724

Congressman Trey Gowdy 104 South Main St., Greenville, SC 29601

May 25, 2017

RE: Case #16-8625

Dear Mr. Gowdy,

I am copying you on my Motion for Findings of Fact and Conclusions of law to the U.S. Supreme Court. The court failed to file a default judgment against the Defendant IRS as required by Rule 55, and actually returned it to me.

Are you in support of this type of suppression of evidence and obstruction of justice for millions of Americans? Is this how the draining of the swamp this administration spoke about is occurring? Do we have two sets of laws now in America and are you defending lawlessness?

We are in serious trouble in this Republic if this is the administration's stance on the law and constitution.

Jeffrey T. Maehr,

924 E. Stollsteimer Rd.,

Pagosa Springs, Colorado 81147

970-731-9724

CC: President Trump

AG Jeff Sessions