

IN THE FOURTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

Case G047746

Superior Court Case Number

30-2012-00582135

COURT OF APPEAL-4TH DIST DIV 3
FILED

JUN 24 2013

Deputy Clerk

Taitz v Obama, Feinstein, Emken

NOTICE BY APPELLANT OF APPELLEES FAILURE TO FILE APPELLEES BRIEF.

NEW INFORMATION PROVIDED HEREIN, IMPORTANT FOR THE ADJUDICATION OF THE CASE.

Orly Taitz, ESQ- Appellant

29839 Santa Margarita, ste 100

Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688

Ph. 949-683-5411, fax 949-766-7603

Orly.Taitz@gmail.com

Argument

Appellant attaches herein a notice of the Fourth District Court of Appeals of the notice sent to the Appellees on June 4, 2013, advising them that they did not file their appellee's brief in time. Appellees were given additional 15 days to submit their brief. Appellees failed to do so.

June 4, 2013 notice states: I Respondent's brief is not filed within 15 days from the date of this notice, the court may decide the appeal upon the record, the opening brief and any argument by the appellant (Cal Rules of Court, rule 8.220(a)(2).

Due to the lack of the appellees' briefs, appellant respectfully requests the court to grant her appeal based on her opening brief.

Additionally appellant submits a declaration relating to new facts that appellant believe will weigh in favor of granting her appeal.

Part of the appeal deals with the motion by the Appellant to compel production of the student registration by Barack Obama at the Occidental college. Appellant Taitz sought those records in light of the fact that over 100 pages of documentary evidence showed Barack Obama using forged IDs and a Social Security number, which was assigned to another individual born in 1890. Taitz sought an expedited motion to compel Obama's registration at the Occidental college. Taitz sought a redacted registration to check Obama's citizenship listed on his application/registration. Taitz sought this information prior to the general election on November 6, 2012. Two attorneys for the Occidental college argued in opposition to the motion to compel production and sought \$4,000 their attorneys fees. This motion was decided in favor of the Occidental college by the lower court.

On June 19, 2013 Appellant Taitz participated in a rally in front of the U.S. Capitol in Washington, DC. She was approached there by a whistleblower, who is an employee of the Higher Education Corporation in Albany, New York. The whistleblower advised Taitz that she personally reviewed the microfilm of Barack Obama's financial aid and it shows that he received financial aid as a foreign student, citizen of Indonesia. Whistleblower wrote for Taitz in her own handwriting her first and last name, her work e-mail address, her personal e-mail address and her home and cell phone numbers. Taitz did her due diligence and independently verified that the whistleblower is indeed employed by the Higher Education Services Corporation in Albany New York. She further checked that Obama transferred from the Occidental college to Columbia University in New York and his financial aid would indeed be handled by the Higher Education Services Corporation in Albany New York(Hereinafter HESC). Whistleblower advised Taitz that the policy of the HESC is not to destroy records and microfilm is contained in the safe of the corporation. She further advised Taitz that several employees of the HESC made copies of the microfilm, in case the management decides to destroy the evidence. She came forward, as she is concerned about fraud being committed and the fact that as a citizen of Indonesia Obama was not eligible to be the president of the United States. Sworn declaration by Taitz is attached.

Taitz provided this information as it weighs in favor of granting her appeal, as it is the most important and most urgent matter of public concern and of national security. Moreover, if further evidence confirms this information and it will be found that attorneys for Occidental college knew that Obama's registration, application and financial aid show him registered as a foreign student and a citizen of Indonesia, then the attorneys for the Occidental college were committing treason against the United States of America and were aiding and abetting the most egregious fraud in the history of this nation.



/s/ Orly Taitz, ESQ

Conclusion


Due to all of the above, the Appeal should be granted in favor of the Appellant.

DECLARATION OF ORLY TAITZ

I am an appellant in *Taitz v Obama, Feinstein, Emken* in front of the Fourth District Court of Appeal, State of California **Case G047746**. I have personal knowledge of the facts described below and attest under the penalty of perjury of the following:

1. On 06.19.2013 I participated in a rally in front of the U.S. Capitol.
2. At the rally I met a whistleblower, who is an employee of the Higher Education Services Corporation in Albany New York. (Hereinafter HESC)
3. The whistleblower advised me that she is seeking to provide to a judge evidence of fraud.
4. The whistleblower stated that she personally reviewed financial aid records of Mr. Barack Obama. She reviewed the financial aid microfilm, where it stated that Mr. Obama received financial aid as a foreign student, citizen of Indonesia.
5. Whistleblower stated that usual modus operandi of the Higher Education Services Corporation, is not to destroy the records and as of the date of our conversation 06.19.2013 the microfilm of the record was in the safe of the corporation.
6. Whistleblower stated that she and several other employees made copies of the aforementioned foreign student record for Mr. Obama in case someone in the corporation management decides to destroy the original records.
7. Whistleblower stated that she made the statement due to the fact that she is concerned with fraud committed by Mr. Obama, as being a citizen of Indonesia he was never legitimate for the U.S. Presidency.
8. Whistleblower provided me and wrote in her own handwriting her first and last name, her home and cell phone numbers and her work and personal e-mail addresses.
9. Whistleblower stated that she is concerned about retaliation by Mr. Obama and Obama regime.
10. I did my due diligence and verified that indeed aforementioned whistleblower is employed by the Higher Education Services Corporation.
11. I verified that Mr. Obama indeed transferred from the Occidental college to the Columbia University in New York, therefore his financial aid would be handled by Albany, New York office.
12. Due to the fact that the whistleblower is concerned of retaliation, I am asking the court to allow to submit her identification information under seal and any testimony, if needed by the court, to be done in camera.

I attest under the penalty of perjury that all of the information is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.



/s/ Dr. Orly Taitz, ESQ

Appellant

Taitz v Obama, Feinstein, Emken

5. Whistleblower stated that usual modus operandi of the Higher Education Services Corporation, is not to destroy the records and as of the date of our conversation 06.19.2013 the microfilm of the record was in the safe of the corporation.
6. Whistleblower stated that she and several other employees made copies of the aforementioned foreign student record for Mr. Obama in case someone in the corporation management decides to destroy the original records.
7. Whistleblower stated that she made the statement due to the fact that she is concerned with fraud committed by Mr. Obama, as being a citizen of Indonesia he was never legitimate for the U.S. Presidency.
8. Whistleblower provided me and wrote in her own handwriting her first and last name, her home and cell phone numbers and her work and personal e-mail addresses.
9. Whistleblower stated that she is concerned about retaliation by Mr. Obama and Obama regime.
10. I did my due diligence and verified that indeed aforementioned whistleblower is employed by the Higher Education Services Corporation.
11. I verified that Mr. Obama indeed transferred from the Occidental college to the Columbia University in New York, therefore his financial aid would be handled by Albany, New York office.
12. Due to the fact that the whistleblower is concerned of retaliation, I am asking the court to allow to submit her identification information under seal and any testimony, if needed by the court, to be done in camera.

I attest under the penalty of perjury that all of the information is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

/s/ Dr. Orly Taitz, ESQ



Appellant

Taitz v Obama, Feinstein, Emken

STATE OF CALIFORNIA - COURT OF APPEAL
FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION THREE

June 4, 2013

ORLY TAITZ,
Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

BARACK OBAMA et al.,
Defendants and Respondents.

G047746
Orange County No. 30-2012-00582135

If respondent's brief is not filed within 15 days from the date of this notice, the court may decide the appeal upon the record, the opening brief, and any oral argument by appellant. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.220(a)(2).)

No additional notices under rule 8.220 will be issued, even if further extensions are granted.

Kevin J. Lane
Acting Clerk/Administrator

By: Bonnie LeSage, Deputy Clerk

cc: See attached list

G047746

Taitz v. Obama et al.

Superior Court of Orange County

✓ Orly Taitz

29839 Santa Margarita Pkwy, Ste. 100

Rancho Santa Margari, CA 92688

Barack Obama

1600 Pennsylvania Ave.

Washington, DC 20005

Elizabeth Emken

P.O. Box 81

Danville, CA 94526

Diane Feinstein

One Post Str., Ste. 2450

San Francisco, CA 94104