


President Donald Trump,
THE WHITE HOUSE
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.,
Washington D.C. 20500

August 13, 2019 **Supreme Court case docketed-Default by U.S.**

Dear Mr. President,

I am copying you on the Previously filed Supreme Court case which has been docketed. The U.S. waived it's rights to respond to the case, which is a default under FRCP Rule 55. I have noticed the court of this.

Respectfully Submitted,



Date: 8-13-19

Jeffrey T. Maehr
924 E. Stollsteimer Rd.,
Pagosa Springs, Colorado [81147]
970-731-9724

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

COPY

MAEHR, JEFFREY T.
Petitioner

vs.

No: 19-5151

USA

WAIVER

The Government hereby waives its right to file a response to the petition in this case, unless requested to do so by the Court.

NOEL J. FRANCISCO
Solicitor General
Counsel of Record

August 05, 2019

cc:

JEFFREY T. MAEHR
924 E. STOLLSTEIMER ROAD
PAGOSA SPRINGS, CO 81147

No. 19-5151

IN THE
**Supreme Court of the
United States**



Jeffrey T. Maehr,

Petitioner

v.

United States

Respondent



Motion to Compel Response From Respondent



Jeffrey T. Maehr
924 E. Stollsteimer Rd.,
Pagosa Springs, Colorado [81147]
(970) 731-9724



Petitioner comes before this honorable court with this Motion to Compel Respondent to respond to Petition filed with the court.

Petitioner received Respondent's waiver of right to respond on August 8, 2019, which raises two main issues Petitioner would ask the court to strongly consider prior to making a decision to possibly deny Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

1. Under FRCP, Rule 55⁽¹⁾, a default occurs when the opposing party fails "to plead or otherwise defend" their position. All lower courts are bound to file this default under failure to respond. It is presumed that this honorable court would also be subject to the same rules for all other courts.

Under Rule 55(d) (See ²), this court can issue a default judgment against Respondent "***only if the claimant establishes a claim or right to relief by evidence that satisfies the court.***" Petitioner has provided this court's own stare decisis, congressional and other testimony and evidence on the questions presented, which are persuasive questions never answered or addressed by Respondent, ever, apart from dismissing them as "frivolous."

This leads Petitioner to his second request...

2. To help this honorable to decide if Rule 55(d) is fulfilled, this court should seek whether Respondent "can" answer the questions with persuasive evidence. Petitioner moves this court to at LEAST ORDER the Respondent to provide foundational answers to the questions presented in order for this honorable court to even be able to decide whether Rule 55(d) is established, and to finally quiet these controversies in this republic on all these issues, being issues of "***first impression***", since no court, since this honorable court's original intent ruling on # one, two, three and five questions presented, with question # four likely never being properly adjudicated under due process in any past court.

Respondent has consistently refused to provide answers to this court's stare decisis on the questions given, (despite Respondent's Mission Statement, and TABOR...) or defend against other issues that, essentially, require simple answers with simple existing evidence that should be readily available. Considering Respondent has consistently responded to Petitioner, and all others similarly situated, regarding questions "which may be challenged through the judicial system"

¹ FRCP 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.

² Rule 55 (d) Judgment Against the United States. A default judgment may be entered against the United States, its officers, or its agencies only if the claimant establishes a claim or right to relief by evidence that satisfies the court.

(See attachment), and that lower courts have consistently refused to provide due process on the actual evidence, or provide findings and conclusions⁽³⁾ in decisions against this court's stare decisis, it is vital that this court finally step in to quiet the contradictions that are now of record.

Considering all of Petitioner's past court cases have not provided answers to the questions, or even addressed the issues with any response at all, and considering that this is the third time that some of these basic questions have been presented to this honorable court, it would seem it is high time Respondent would be held accountable for redress of grievances it has routinely denied Americans since the mid 90's, or before.

Therefore, Petitioner moves this honorable court to either enter a default judgment against Respondent, and provide lawful and just remedy to Petitioner, considering the questions and evidence presented are significant, being this court's own original rulings, or,

To ORDER Respondent to finally answer the legitimate questions which are of constitutional level issues, and certainly, because they affect 150+ million Americans in various ways to this day.

Respectfully Submitted,



Date: August 9th, 2019

Jeffrey T. Maehr,
924 E. Stollsteimer Rd.,
Pagosa Springs, Colorado [81147]
(970) 731-9724

³ FRCPA Rule 52; "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.*, No. 01-46. 2.535 U.S. 743, 122 S. Ct. 1864, 152 L. Ed. 2d 962, (2002).



SMALL BUSINESS/Self-EMPLOYED DIVISION

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20224

Exhibit - CA

September 11, 2008

Jeffret T. Maehr
924 E. Stollsteimer Rd
Pagosa Springs, CO 81147

Dear Mr. Maehr:

This responds to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request of August 20, 2008, received in our office on September 10, 2008.

You asked for documentation clarifying some words used in the IR Code.

The Freedom of Information Act does not require agencies to respond to interrogatories. It also does not require agencies to conduct research to answer substantive tax questions or decide which resolution, decision, or statutes you are seeking. Furthermore, the Act does not require an agency to respond to statements that may be more appropriately addressed in judicial proceedings. The Act does not require agencies to provide explanations and/or correct the requester's misinterpretation of information.

To the extent you are seeking records that establish the authority of the Internal Revenue Service to assess, enforce, and collect taxes, the Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution authorized Congress to impose an income tax. Congress did so in Title 26 of the United States Code, commonly known as the Internal Revenue Code (IRC). The IRC may contain information responsive to portions of your request. It is available at many bookstores, public libraries and on the Internet at www.irs.gov.

Income tax filing requirements are supported by statute and implementing regulations, which may be challenged through the judicial system, not through the FOIA. It is not the policy of the Internal Revenue Service to engage in correspondence regarding the interpretation and enforcement of the IRC. We will not reply to future letters concerning these issues.

/